Print ISSN 0253-8040

Online ISSN 0974-8164

# Indian Journal of Weed Science

Volume 45 2 2013

Available Online @ www.indianjournals.com

## **Indian Society of Weed Science**

Directorate of Weed Science Research Jabalpur - 482004 Website: www.isws.org.in



## **INDIAN SOCIETY OF WEED SCIENCE**

## (Founded in 1968) Regd. S. No. SOR/BLU/DR/518/08-09 IJWS REGD. NO. MAG (5) PRB 249/82-83

### **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

| President                | Dr. N.T. Yaduraju, Hyderabad              |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Vice-President           | Dr. T.V. Ramachandra Prasad, Bengaluru    |  |  |  |  |
| Vice-President (Co-opt)  | Prof. R.K. Ghosh, Kalyani                 |  |  |  |  |
| Secretary                | Dr. A.R. Sharma, Jabalpur                 |  |  |  |  |
| Joint Secretary          | Dr. C. Chinnusamy, Coimbatore             |  |  |  |  |
| Joint Secretary (Co-opt) | Dr. J.S. Mishra, Hyderabad                |  |  |  |  |
| Treasurer                | Dr. Shobha Sondhia, Jabalpur              |  |  |  |  |
| Past Presidents          | Drs. R.S. Choudhry, C. Thakur, V.S. Mani, |  |  |  |  |

Drs. R.S. Choudhry, C. Thakur, V.S. Mani, K. Krishnamurthy, U.C. Upadhyay, H.S. Gill, S.K. Mukhopadhyay, S. Sankaran, G.B. Singh, V.M. Bhan, L.S. Brar, R.P. Singh, R.K. Malik, N.T. Yaduraju Jay G. Varshney and T.V. Muniyappa

## **EDITORIAL BOARD**

# Chief Editor : Dr. Sushilkumar, Jabalpur Members:

| Dr. J.S. Mishra, Hyderabad  | Dr. A.N. Rao, Hyderabad          | Dr. Ashok Yadav, Hisar            |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Dr. B. Duary, Sriniketan    | Dr. C.R. Chinnamuthu, Coimbatore | Dr. K.N. Kalyan Murthy, Bengaluru |
| Dr. R. Devendra, Bengaluru  | Dr. R.P. Dubey, Jabalpur         | Dr. Shashi Bala Singh, New Delhi  |
| Dr. Suresh Gautam, Palampur | Dr. T.K. Das, New Delhi          | Dr. V.S.G.R. Naidu, Rajamundary   |
|                             |                                  |                                   |

## **OVERSEAS EDITORS**

| Dr. B.S. Chauhan, Philippines   | Dr. K.N. Reddy, USA          |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Dr. Mahesh K. Upadhyaya, Canada | Dr. Mayank S. Malik, USA     |
| Dr. Megh Singh, USA             | Dr. Prasanta C. Bhowmik, USA |

## **COUNCILLORS**

| Andhra Pradesł | n Dr. A.S. Rao, Hyderabad               | Assam            | Dr. J. Deka, Jorhat             |
|----------------|---|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Bihar          | Dr. Devendra Singh, Pusa                | Chhattisgarh     | Dr. A.P. Singh, Raipur          |
| Goa            | Dr. B.L. Manjunath, Goa                 | Gujarat          | Dr. R.B. Patel, Anand           |
| Haryana        | Dr. S.S. Punia, Hisar                   | Himachal Pradesh | Dr. Neelam Sharma, Palampur     |
| J & K          | Dr. Anil Kumar Sharma, Jammu            | Karnataka        | Dr. Ramesh Babu, Dharwad        |
| Kerala         | Dr. T. Girija, Thrissur                 | Madhya Pradesh   | Dr. M.L. Kewat, Jabalpur        |
| Maharashtra    | Dr. P.S. Bodke, Rahauri                 | New Delhi        | Dr. Madhuban Gopal, New Delhi   |
| Orissa         | Dr. M.M. Mishra, Bhubaneswar            | Punjab           | Dr. M.S. Bhullar, Ludhiana      |
| Rajasthan      | Dr. N.K. Sinha, Jaisalmer               | Tamil Nadu       | Dr. R. Balasubramanian, Madurai |
| Pondicherry    | Dr. R. Poonguzhalan, Karaikal           | Uttar Pradesh    | Dr. Narendra Kumar, Kanpur      |
| Uttarakhand    | Dr. S.K. Guru, Pantnagar                | West Bengal      | Dr. P.K. Mukherjee, Cooch Bihar |
| North East Rev | gion (excluding Assem) Dr. D.I. Reikhov | va Baranani      |                                 |

North-East Region (excluding Assam) Dr. D.J. Rajkhowa, Barapani

## **COUNCILLORS FROM INDUSTRY**

Dr. Abhijeet Bose, Atul Pesticides Dr. Prajwal P. Nalwade, Excel Crop Care Dr. Devraj Arya, Monsanto Dr. Rajendara Deshmukh, Syngenta



# Weed Science

| Volume 45   | Number 2  | April-June, 2013 |
|---|---|------------------|
| Full length articles  |   |                  |
| <b>Evaluation of cultivars and herbicide</b><br>Pramod Kumar, Yashwant Singh and U                            | es for control of barnyard grass and nutsedge in <i>boro</i> ric<br>.P. Singh               | ce 76-79         |
| and their effect on rice  | ng diazotrophs from rhizosphere of bermuda grass  | 80-85            |
| C. Sarathambal and K. Ilamurugu   |   |                  |
| <b>Efficacy of clodinafop, isoproturon at as influenced by fertilizer application</b><br>Tayyeb Farag Hessain | nd their sequential application on <i>durum</i> wheat<br>n                                  | 86-89            |
| <b>Bioefficacy of pinoxaden in combinat</b><br>Suman Shoeran, S.S.Punia, Ashok Yada                           | tion with other herbicides against complex weed flora in<br>av and Samunder Singh           | n wheat 90-92    |
| <b>Resource conservation techniques an</b><br>R.K. Jat, R.S. Banga and Ashok Yadav                            | d pendimethalin for control of weeds in <i>durum</i> wheat co                               | ultivars 93-98   |
| Nutrient removal by weeds and crops<br>cropping system<br>Navell Chander, Suresh Kumar, Rames                 | s as affected by herbicide combinations in soybean-whea<br>h and Surinder Singh Rana        | at 99-105        |
| Effect of nitrogen and weed control of R.R. Upasani, R. Thakur, A.N. Puran and                                |   | 106-108          |
| <b>Efficacy of herbicides on wheat and t</b><br>Asha Arora, S.S. Tomar and Shobha So                          | c <b>heir terminal residues in soil, grain and straw</b><br>ondhia                          | 109-112          |
| Weed management in lentil<br>R.B. Yadav, Vivek, R.V. Singh and K.G  | a Yadav   | 113-115          |
| <b>Integration of chemical and cultural</b><br>A.H. Kalhapure, B.T. Shete and P.S. Bo                         | <b>methods for weed management in groundnut</b><br>odake                                    | 116-119          |
| and weed management   | planted sugarcane as influenced by nutrient<br>Kumar, Sanjay Kumar and Naresh Kumar         | 120-125          |
| Integrated weed management in garl<br>Suresh Kumar, S.S. Rana, Navell Chan                                    |   | 126-130          |
| <b>Evaluation of toxins of phytopathoge</b><br>Jaya Singh, Saurabh Gupta, Suraj Singl                         | enic fungus for eco-friendly management of <i>Parthenium</i><br>h Chauhan and Deepak Mishra | 131-134          |

## Short communications

| Efficacy of chlorimuron-ethyl against weeds in transplanted rice<br>Pooran Singh Chauhan, A.K. Jha and Monika Soni   | 135-136 |
|--|---------|
| <b>Pre- and post-emergence herbicides for integrated weed management in summer greengram</b><br>S.K. Chhodavadia and R.K Mathukiya and V.K. Dobariya                     | 137-139 |
| Early post-emergence herbicides for weed control in soybean<br>C. Sangeetha, C. Chinnusamy and N.K. Prabhakaran  | 140-142 |
| Weed management in irrigated organic finger millet<br>Basavaraj Patil, V.C. Reddy, T.V. Ramachandra Prasad, B.C. Shankaralingappa, R. Devendra<br>and K.N. Kalyanamurthy | 143-145 |
| Field demonstration of integrated weed managment in sorghum<br>A.S. Jadhav   | 146-147 |
| <b>Integrated weed management in berseem</b><br>S.H. Pathan, A.B. Kamble and M.G. Gavit  | 148-150 |

Indian Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 76–79, 2013

## Evaluation of cultivars and herbicides for control of barnyard grass and nutsedge in *boro* rice

## Pramod Kumar\*, Yashwant Singh and U.P. Singh

Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh 221 005

Received: 1 February 2013; Revised: 27 April 2013

#### ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted to test the efficacy of different herbicides and cultivars during *boro* seasons of 2009 and 2010 on clay loam soils at BHU, Varanasi. The herbicides used were butachlor 1500 g/ha (pre-emergence) *fb* 2,4–D 500 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 20-25 DAT, pretilachlor 750 g/ha (pre-emergence) *fb* azimsulfuron 35 g/ha + NIS (0.2%) at 15 DAT, penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 15 DAT, ethoxysulfuron 18 g/ha + fenoxaprop + safner 56 g/ha + (NIS 0.25%) at 15 DAT, propanil 3000 g/ha + trichlorpyr 500 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 20-25 DAT and pyrazosulfuron 20 g/ha (pre-emergence) *fb* bispyribac 25 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 25 DAT under '*Gautam*', '*Prabhat*' and '*Krishna Hamsa*' cultivars. Weed count and its dry matter under '*Prabhat*' cultivar were lower than that with other two cultivars for both *Echinochola* and *Cyperus* spp. resulting in higher weed control efficiency with *Prabhat* as compared to other two cultivars where as, significantly highest grain yield of 4.15 t/ha was obtained in *Gautam* cultivar due to higher growth and yield attributes. The application of ethoxysulfuron + fenoxaprop was most effective in minimizing population of *Cyperus* spp. and its dry matter with highest WCE. '*Gautam*' cultivar with highest net return of ₹ 24,898/ha and benefit cost ratio of 1.19 and pretilachlor *fb* azimsulfuron with net return of ₹ 27,461/ha and benefit: cost ratio of 1.32 were found most profitable among the cultivars and herbicidal treatments, respectively.

Key words: Boro rice, Cultivars, Herbicides, Unweeded control, Weed free

In India, rice occupies an area of 45.5 million hectares with production of 99.2 million tonnes and occupies second position, after China among the rice growing countries of the world. contributing about 41.8% of total food grain production and accounting 20-25% of the agricultural GDP (Rai 2006). Uttar Pradesh is the second largest rice growing state in the country, with an area of 6.03 million ha and production of 13.1 million tonnes (Anonymous 2010). Productivity of boro rice in eastern Uttar Pradesh is only two-third (2.0 t/ha) as against the average productivity of 3.0 t/ha of eastern India. Weed competition is one of the prime yield limiting biotic constraints resulting into yield reduction to the tune of 28 to 45% (Raju and Reddy 1995, Singh et al. 2003). Echinochloa spp. and Cyperus spp. are major weeds responsible for yield reduction in rice. Varieties with their characters such as growth, vigor and smothering effects affect the weed growth in boro rice cultivation. The present study was carried out to evaluate the performance of different rice cultivars along with promising herbicides for appropriate weed management programme.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiment was conducted during boro seasons of 2009 and 2010 at Agricultural Research Farm, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi. The soil of the experimental field was Gangetic alluvial having clay loam in texture with pH 7.49. It was moderately fertile, being medium in available organic carbon (0.51%), low in available nitrogen (196 kg/ ha), and medium in available phosphorus (24.05 kg  $P_2O_5$ ha) and potassium (230.05 kg/ha). The experiment was laid out in split-plot design with three cultivars ('Gautam', 'Prabhat' and 'Krishna Hamsa') in main plots and nine weed control treatments (unweeded control, weed free, and weeding twice at 30 and 50 DAT, butachlor 1500 g/ ha (pre-emergence) fb 2,4-D 500 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 20-25 DAT, pretilachlor 1.0 kg fb azimsulfuron (preemergence) 35 g/ha+NIS (0.25%) at 15 DAT, penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 15 DAT, ethoxysulfuron 18 g/ha + fenoxaprop + safner 56 g/ha + (NIS 0.25%) at 15 DAT, propanil 3000 g/ha + trichlorpyr 500 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 20-25 DAT and pyrazosulfuron 20 g/ha (preemergence) fb bispyribac 25 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 25 DAT) in sub-plots. All the herbicides were applied in satu-

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: pramod.ran.bhu@gmail.com

rated soil moisture as per protocol of application time. Two to three seedlings per hill were transplanted at spacing of 20 x 10 cm on 27th January, 2009 and 2nd February, 2010. Crop was supplied with nutrients i.e. 120, 60, 60 kg N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O as well as 5 kg Zn/ha. Full quantity of P2O5, K2O and Zn through diammonium phosphate, muriate of potash and zinc sulphate and one half of N was applied as basal dose at the time of puddling. Remaining N in form of urea was top dressed in two equal splits, at active tillering and panicle initiation stage. The data on weed count and their dry matter (at 20, 40, 60, 80 DAT and harvest) were recorded with the help of a quadrate  $(0.5 \times 0.5 \text{ m})$  at two places per plot and then converted into per square metre. Weed control efficiency (WCE) was calculated based on weed dry weight. The data on weed count and dry weight were analysed using square root ( $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ ) transformation.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The most dominant weed species found in the experimental field throughout the crop growth in rice were; *Cynodon dactylon* and *Echinochloa* spp. among grasses: *Cyperus* spp. among sedges and *Ipomoea aquatica*, *Marsilea minuta*, *Nymphaea nouchali*, *Pistia stratiotes*, *Veronica anagallis-aquatica*, *Ranunculus sceleratus* among broad-leaved. *Echinochola* spp. constituted 28.3% and *Cyperus* spp. 24.9% of total weed population at maximum weed flush (80 DAT).

### Effect on weeds

The pooled data of two years indicated that '*Prabhat*' cultivar registered significantly lower number of *Echinochloa* spp. (Table 1) and *Cyperus* spp. (Table 2), as well as its dry matter at almost all the stages of crop growth. Vigorous crop growth and droopy lower leaves

| Table 1. Effect of cultivars and herbicides | on weed count and | weed dry matter of | of <i>Echinochola</i> spp. and weed |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| control efficiency (pooled data of ty       | vo years)         |                    |                                     |

|                           | W      | eed count ( | no./m <sup>2</sup> ) at | different E | DAT     | Weed dry matter (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) at different DAT |         |         |          |          |
|---------------------------|--------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|---------|--|---------|---------|----------|----------|
| Treatment                 | 20     | 40          | 60                      | 80          | Harvest | 20   | 40      | 60      | 80       | Harvest  |
| Cultivars                 |        |             |                         |             |         |  |         |         |          |          |
| 'Gautam'                  | 1.01   | 2.83        | 2.37                    | 2.60        | 2.86    | 0.93   | 1.38    | 3.23    | 3.76     | 5.13     |
|                           | (0.96) | (13.74)     | (8.00)                  | (10.59)     | (12.59) | (0.66)   | (2.39)  | (15.27) | (23.54)  | (40.23)  |
| 'Prabhat'                 | 0.93   | 2.63        | 2.21                    | 2.38        | 2.66    | 0.91   | 1.58    | 2.97    | 3.28     | 4.80     |
|                           | (0.59) | (11.04)     | (7.07)                  | (8.85)      | (11.04) | (0.71)   | (3.41)  | (14.13) | (17.67)  | (33.93)  |
| 'Krishna Hamsa'           | 1.11   | 2.80        | 2.67                    | 3.08        | 3.28    | 0.94   | 1.88    | 3.30    | 4.47     | 5.34     |
|                           | (1.15) | (12.89)     | (13.56)                 | (18.22)     | (17.44) | (0.59)   | (5.23)  | (18.65) | (30.54)  | (44.45)  |
| LSD (P=0.05)              | N.S.   | N.S.        | 0.42                    | 0.12        | 0.26    | N.S.   | 0.26    | 0.44    | 0.25     | 0.23     |
| Herbicides                |        |             |                         |             |         |  |         |         |          |          |
| Hand weeding twice        | 1.16   | 3.23        | 1.22                    | 2.00        | 2.17    | 1.10   | 1.60    | 1.80    | 3.36     | 4.96     |
| -                         | (1.44) | (12.11)     | (1.33)                  | (4.56)      | (4.56)  | (1.33)   | (2.55)  | (3.74)  | (14.28)  | (27.23)  |
| Butachlor <i>fb</i> 2,4-D | 0.98   | 1.73        | 2.67                    | 1.89        | 2.92    | 0.84   | 1.48    | 4.84    | 3.21     | 5.68     |
|                           | (0.78) | (3.00)      | (7.67)                  | (3.67)      | (10.44) | (0.31)   | (2.30)  | (25.09) | (11.13)  | (35.58)  |
| Pretilachlor <i>fb</i>    | 1.20   | 1.17        | 1.51                    | 1.48        | 1.48    | 1.04   | 0.91    | 1.22    | 1.76     | 2.17     |
| azimsulfuron              | (1.44) | (1.44)      | (2.78)                  | (2.44)      | (2.33)  | (1.11)   | (0.52)  | (1.43)  | (3.92)   | (5.74)   |
| Penoxsulam                | 0.90   | 1.79        | 1.77                    | 1.53        | 1.77    | 0.80   | 1.15    | 1.92    | 2.30     | 3.07     |
|                           | (0.44) | (3.67)      | (3.89)                  | (3.56)      | (3.67)  | (0.19)   | (1.23)  | (4.96)  | (8.04)   | (11.08)  |
| Ethoxysufuron +           | 0.96   | 2.16        | 1.92                    | 2.27        | 2.83    | 0.90   | 1.17    | 3.19    | 3.65     | 4.64     |
| fenoxaprop                | (0.67) | (7.22)      | (4.11)                  | (5.78)      | (8.67)  | (0.49)   | (1.29)  | (10.72) | (14.76)  | (22.91)  |
| Propanil +                | 0.91   | 4.22        | 4.02                    | 4.61        | 4.73    | 0.92   | 2.20    | 5.03    | 6.49     | 8.47     |
| trichlopyr                | (0.56) | (19.11)     | (18.44)                 | (23.67)     | (24.67) | (0.59)   | (5.16)  | (27.26) | (43.27)  | (77.53)  |
| Pyrazosulfuron <i>fb</i>  | 0.95   | 2.05        | 1.44                    | 1.99        | 2.27    | 0.78   | 1.08    | 1.58    | 2.79     | 4.02     |
| bispyribac                | (0.67) | (5.78)      | (2.11)                  | (4.56)      | (6.44)  | (0.14)   | (0.94)  | (2.63)  | (9.98)   | (17.38)  |
| Unweeded                  | 1.40   | 7.71        | 6.49                    | 7.68        | 7.55    | 1.27   | 4.20    | 8.21    | 10.22    | 12.06    |
|                           | (2.11) | (60.67)     | (45.56)                 | (64.78)     | (62.44) | (1.69)   | (19.08) | (68.32) | (109.88) | (158.38) |
| Weed free                 | 0.71   | 0.71        | 0.71                    | 0.71        | 0.71    | 0.71   | 0.71    | 0.71    | 0.71     | 0.71     |
|                           | (0.00) | (0.00)      | (0.00)                  | (0.00)      | (0.00)  | (0.00)   | (0.00)  | (0.00)  | (0.00)   | (0.00)   |
| LSD (P=0.05)              | 0.32   | 0.56        | 0.54                    | 0.54        | 0.49    | 0.30   | 0.45    | 0.56    | 0.76     | 0.64     |

Values within parentheses are original. Data are subjected to square root transformation ( $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ ). *fb* : followed by; DAT: Day after transplanting

of '*Prabhat*' cultivar might be responsible for intercepting the sunlight to restrict the profused weed growth, ultimately reduced weed infestation. These observations were in conformity with reports of Pillai (1977), Thakur *et al.* (1995) and Singh *et al.* (2004). The higher weed control efficiencies of 67.9 and 60.2 for *Echinochloa* spp. as well as 67.7 and 52.7 for *Cyperus* spp. at 80 DAT and harvest respectively in '*Prabhat*' cultivar were might be due to lower weed dry matter accumulation as compared to other two cultivars (Table 3).

Application of pretilachlor (pre-emergence) fb azimsulfuron 15 DAT was most effective in controlling *Echinochloa* spp. with significantly lower weed count and dry matter and highest weed control efficiencies (82.78 and 82.01% at 80 DAT and harvest) which might be due to higher efficacy of these herbicides. Other herbicidal treatments except propanil + trichlopyr were also effective in controlling *Echinochloa* spp.

The application of ethoxysulfuron + fenoxaprop at 15 DAT had the best performance in reducing the population of *Cyperus* spp. recording significantly lower weed count and its dry matter. The herbicidal treatment butachlor *fb* 2,4-*D* as well as pyrazosulfuron *fb* bispyribac was also very effective for control of *Cyperus* spp. The highest weed control efficiencies were achieved with ethoxysulfuron + fenoxaprop recording a WCE of 84.02 and 70.61% at 80 DAT and harvest.

## Effect on crop

Among all the three cultivars, '*Gautam*' recorded significantly higher grain yield (4.14 t/ha) than '*Prabhat*' (3.78 t/ha) and '*Krishna Hamsa*' (3.65 t/ha) despite of higher weed count and dry matter than '*Prabhat*' cultivar due to higher growth and yield attributes which might have resulted in higher yield (Table 3). Similar results have also been reported by Singh *et al.* (2004).

| Table 2. Effect of cultivars and herbicides | on weed count and weed dry matter of <i>Cyperus</i> spp. and weed control |
|---|---|
| efficiency (pooled data of two year         | :s)   |

|                          | Weed count (no./m <sup>2</sup> ) at different DAT |        |         |         |         | Weed dry matter (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) at different DAT |        |         |         |         |
|--------------------------|---|--------|---------|---------|---------|--|--------|---------|---------|---------|
| Treatment                | 20  | 40     | 60      | 80      | Harvest | 20   | 40     | 60      | 80      | Harvest |
| Cultivars                |   |        |         |         |         |  |        |         |         |         |
| 'Gautam'                 | 0.85  | 1.09   | 2.33    | 2.30    | 1.42    | 0.73   | 0.79   | 1.43    | 2.00    | 1.24    |
|                          | (0.63)  | (1.78) | (12.52) | (10.00) | (3.48)  | (0.06)   | (0.19) | (3.63)  | (6.46)  | (2.22)  |
| 'Prabhat'                | 0.76  | 0.72   | 1.68    | 2.10    | 1.40    | 0.73   | 0.71   | 1.20    | 1.72    | 1.24    |
|                          | (0.15)  | (0.04) | (6.04)  | (7.52)  | (3.69)  | (0.06)   | (0.01) | (2.13)  | (4.66)  | (2.34)  |
| 'Krishna Hamsa'          | 0.84  | 0.74   | 2.74    | 2.83    | 1.84    | 0.78   | 0.72   | 1.44    | 2.22    | 1.43    |
|                          | (0.44)  | (0.11) | (13.33) | (15.22) | (5.96)  | (0.21)   | (0.03) | (2.81)  | (8.98)  | (3.66)  |
| LSD (P=0.05)             | N.S.  | 0.20   | 0.40    | 0.35    | N.S.    | N.S.   | 0.04   | 0.12    | 0.26    | N.S.    |
| Herbicides               |   |        |         |         |         |  |        |         |         |         |
| Hand weeding twice       | 0.86  | 0.93   | 1.62    | 2.27    | 1.92    | 0.77   | 0.75   | 0.90    | 1.62    | 1.78    |
|                          | (0.44)  | (1.22) | (5.33)  | (6.67)  | (5.56)  | (0.17)   | (0.09) | (0.44)  | (2.94)  | (4.46)  |
| Butachlor fb 2,4-D       | 0.71  | 0.71   | 1.23    | 1.24    | 1.15    | 0.71   | 0.71   | 1.44    | 0.99    | 0.94    |
|                          | (0.00)  | (0.00) | (2.67)  | (2.22)  | (1.56)  | (0.00)   | (0.00) | (3.47)  | (0.68)  | (0.69)  |
| Pretilachlor <i>fb</i>   | 1.13  | 1.16   | 3.00    | 2.73    | 1.63    | 0.77   | 0.81   | 0.92    | 1.84    | 1.09    |
| azimsulfuron             | (1.89)  | (1.94) | (17.33) | (12.89) | (4.17)  | (0.17)   | (0.23) | (0.58)  | (4.10)  | (1.03)  |
| Penoxsulam               | 0.71  | 0.71   | 1.41    | 1.73    | 1.12    | 0.71   | 0.71   | 0.86    | 1.55    | 0.82    |
|                          | (0.00)  | (0.00) | (2.89)  | (6.89)  | (1.67)  | (0.00)   | (0.00) | (0.38)  | (4.92)  | (0.39)  |
| Ethoxysufuron +          | 0.76  | 0.71   | 0.71    | 0.93    | 0.97    | 0.75   | 0.71   | 0.71    | 0.85    | 0.77    |
| fenoxaprop               | (0.11)  | (0.00) | (0.00)  | (0.78)  | (1.00)  | (0.09)   | (0.00) | (0.00)  | (0.40)  | (0.14)  |
| Propanil + trichlopyr    | 0.94  | 0.96   | 4.26    | 4.28    | 2.58    | 0.83   | 0.76   | 1.94    | 3.63    | 2.29    |
|                          | (0.89)  | (0.78) | (23.67) | (23.33) | (10.44) | (0.44)   | (0.10) | (4.58)  | (16.26) | (7.97)  |
| Pyrazosulfuron <i>fb</i> | 0.71  | 0.71   | 1.33    | 1.38    | 0.85    | 0.71   | 0.71   | 1.25    | 1.31    | 0.78    |
| bispyribac               | (0.00)  | (0.00) | (3.11)  | (2.33)  | (0.56)  | (0.00)   | (0.00) | (2.63)  | (1.78)  | (0.19)  |
| Unweeded                 | 0.81  | 1.07   | 5.98    | 6.44    | 3.06    | 0.76   | 0.81   | 3.51    | 5.32    | 2.62    |
|                          | (0.33)  | (1.83) | (40.67) | (43.11) | (14.44) | (0.11)   | (0.24) | (13.63) | (29.24) | (9.78)  |
| Weed free                | 0.71  | 0.71   | 0.71    | 0.71    | 0.71    | 0.71   | 0.71   | 0.71    | 0.71    | 0.71    |
|                          | (0.00)  | (0.00) | (0.00)  | (0.00)  | (0.00)  | (0.00)   | (0.00) | (0.00)  | (0.00)  | (0.00)  |
| LSD (P=0.05)             | 0.22  | 0.34   | 0.66    | 0.73    | 0.51    | N.S.   | 0.08   | 0.34    | 0.44    | 0.41    |

Values within parentheses are original. Data are subjected to square root transformation ( $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ ). *fb* : followed by; DAT: Day after transplanting

| Treatment                           |        | WCE (%) in<br>Echinochloa |        | WCE (%) in<br><i>Cyperus</i> |               | Tillers<br>/hill at | Grain<br>yield | Net returns             | Benefit :  |
|-------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------|------------|
| Troumont                            | 80 DAT | Harvest                   | 80 DAT | Harvest                      | weight<br>(g) | 80 DAT              | (t/ha)         | (x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | cost ratio |
| Cultivars                           |        |                           |        |                              |               |                     |                |                         |            |
| 'Gautam'                            | 63.2   | 57.5                      | 62.4   | 52.7                         | 22.76         | 17.48               | 4.15           | 24.89                   | 1.19       |
| 'Prabhat'                           | 67.9   | 60.2                      | 67.7   | 52.7                         | 22.29         | 16.70               | 3.78           | 21.35                   | 1.01       |
| 'Krishna Hamsa'                     | 56.3   | 55.7                      | 58.3   | 45.4                         | 21.83         | 14.90               | 3.65           | 19.85                   | 0.94       |
| LSD (P=0.05)                        | -      | -                         | -      | -                            | 0.48          | 1.25                | 0.09           | 0.10                    | 0.05       |
| Herbicides                          |        |                           |        |                              |               |                     |                |                         |            |
| Hand weeding twice                  | 67.1   | 58.9                      | 69.5   | 32.1                         | 22.89         | 18.78               | 4.41           | 26.80                   | 1.21       |
| Butachlor $fb$ 2,4 – D              | 68.6   | 52.9                      | 81.4   | 64.1                         | 21.80         | 14.54               | 3.59           | 20.57                   | 1.05       |
| Pretilachlor fb azimsulfuron        | 82.8   | 82.0                      | 65.4   | 58.4                         | 22.61         | 17.76               | 4.35           | 27.46                   | 1.32       |
| Penoxsulam                          | 77.5   | 74.5                      | 70.9   | 68.7                         | 22.06         | 15.61               | 3.84           | 23.08                   | 1.17       |
| Ethoxysufuron + fenoxaprop          | 64.3   | 61.5                      | 84.0   | 70.6                         | 22.46         | 16.99               | 4.12           | 25.78                   | 1.30       |
| Propanil + trichlopyr               | 36.5   | 29.8                      | 31.8   | 12.6                         | 21.58         | 13.78               | 3.38           | 17.85                   | 0.89       |
| Pyrazosulfuron <i>fb</i> bispyribac | 72.7   | 66.7                      | 75.4   | 70.2                         | 22.44         | 16.24               | 3.95           | 21.74                   | 0.98       |
| Unweeded                            | 0.0    | 0.0                       | 0.0    | 0.0                          | 21.36         | 12.34               | 2.41           | 9.20                    | 0.50       |
| Weed free                           | -      | -                         | -      | -                            | 23.43         | 21.21               | 4.65           | 25.79                   | 1.00       |
| LSD (P=0.05)                        | -      | -                         | -      | -                            | 0.63          | 0.95                | 0.10           | 1.14                    | 0.06       |

 Table 3. Effect of cultivars and herbicides on weed control efficiency, 1000-grain weight, tillers/hill, yield and economics in *boro* rice (pooled data of two years)

Maximum grain yield was recorded in the treatment hand weeding twice at 30 and 50 DAT with an increase of 82.7% in yield over unweeded control. Pretilachlor *fb* azimsulfuron was the most effective among herbicidal treatments realizing 80.2% higher grain yield over unweeded control which was also statistically similar to hand weeding twice.

On the basis of two years mean, the maximum net returns and benefit : cost ratio were obtained by '*Gautam*' followed by '*Prabhat*' cultivar. The corresponding values for net returns and benefit : cost ratio were ₹ 24.898/ha and 1.19 and ₹ 21,352/ha and 1.01, respectively. Among herbicides, pretilachlor *fb* azimsulfuron recorded highest net returns (₹ 27,461/ha) and benefit: cost ratio (1.32) which was followed by ethoxysulfuron + fenoxaprop with net return of ₹ 25,783/ha and benefit : cost ratio as 1.30. Though, weed free condition gave the highest yield but net returns and benefit : cost ratio were not highest due to involvement of more labour, resulting in higher cost.

It was concluded that '*Prabhat*' followed by '*Gautam*' was found to be the most effective boro rice cultivar in respect of minimizing weed count of *Echinochola* and *Cyperus* spp., The cultivar '*Gautam*' showed its superiority over '*Prabhat*' and '*Krishna Hamsa*' in respect of yield attributes and yield. The herbicidal treatment pretilachlor 750 g/ha (pre-emergence) fb azimsulfuron 35 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 15 DAT was most

effective in reducing the population and dry matter of *Echinochloa* spp. where as ethoxysulfuron 18 g/ha + fenoxaprop + safner 56 g/ha + (NIS 0.25%) at 15 DAT was most effective in reducing population of *Cyperus* spp. '*Gautam*' cultivar gave significantly higher net return (₹ 24,898/ha) and benefi:cost ratio (1.19) over '*Prabhat*' and '*Krishna Hamsa*'. Pretilachlor 750 g/ha (pre-emergence) *fb* azimsulfuron 35 g/ha + NIS (0.25%) at 15 DAT recorded significantly higher net return (₹ 27,461/ha) and benefit : cost ratio (1.32).

#### REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 2010. Agricultural Statistics at a Glance. Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Pillai KG. 1977. Integrated weed management in rice. *Indian Farming* **26**(12): 17-23.
- Raju RA and Reddy MN. 1995. Performance of herbicide mixtures for weed control in transplanted rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 27: 106-107.
- Singh G, Singh VP, Singh M and Singh SP. 2003. Effect of anilofos and triclopyr on grassy and non-grassy weeds in transplanted rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **35**: 30-32.
- Singh UP, Singh Y and Kumar Vinod. 2004. Effect of weed management and cultivars on boro rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) and weeds. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **36**(1&2): 57-59.
- Thakur R, Singh RK and Chaudhary RL. 1995. Prabhat- a very early maturing rice variety released in Bihar. *International Rice Research Newsletter* **20**(2): 11.



## Saline tolerant plant growth promoting diazotrophs from rhizosphere of bermuda grass and their effect on rice

C. Sarathambal\* and K. Ilamurugu

Department of Agricultural Microbiology, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu 641 003

## Received: 28 February 2013; Revised: 24 May 2013

### ABSTRACT

In this study, beneficial effects of multifaceted growth promoting isolates for rice were investigated under two different salt concentrations in pot culture conditions. Two most salt tolerant isolates (TRY2) *Serratia* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. (TRY4) were selected and their growth promoting characters were studied under slight and moderate NaCl concentration. Isolates *Serratia* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. were able to fix the nitrogen and solubilise phosphate, synthesise IAA, acc deaminase regardless of NaCl concentration in most cases, under conditions of salinity. In pot experiments, plant growth (plant height, dry weight, and chlorophyll content) was promoted by bacterial inoculation with 2.9 and 5.8 g NaCl/kg soil. In this study, uptake nutrients (N<sup>+</sup>, P<sup>+</sup>, and K<sup>+</sup>) were increased regardless of NaCl concentration with inoculation of *Serratia* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. and uptake of Na<sup>+</sup> was reduced with treatments receiving 5.8 NaCl/kg soil with *Serratia* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. isolates used as inoculants as compared to control. The present observations showed that strains *Serratia* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. partially alleviated the saline stress in rice, likely through the integration of several mechanisms that improve the plant response.

Key words: Bacillus sp, Plant growth promoting diazotrophs, Rice, Salinity stress, Serratia sp.

Salinity is one of the most serious environmental problems influencing crop growth throughout the world. In India, out of an estimated area of 187.7 million ha of total degraded lands, 8.1 million ha are salt affected in which 3.1 million ha are in the coastal regions (Sziderics *et al.* 2007). In most saline soils, sodium chloride is the predominant salt species, and its effect can be observed by decreased productivity or plant death (Munns 2005). Most of the plants possess several mechanisms to decrease the negative effects of salinity including regulation and compartmentalization of ions, synthesis of compatible solutes, induction of antioxidative enzymes, induction of plant hormones, and changes in photosynthetic pathways (Parida and Das 2005).

*Cynodon dactylon* Pers. (Poaceae), a hardy perennial grass, is one of the most commonly occurring weeds in India. It is widely accepted that the rhizosphere of any plant species is a unique niche harboring diversified bacterial communities, which serve as potential resource for bioprospecting. The rhizosphere of plant species growing profusely under stress-conditions harbors novel diazotrophs to meet their nitrogen requirement as observed in salt marsh grasses such as Sp. artina alterniflora, *Juncus*  *roemerianus* (Bagwell and Lovell 2000), ligotrophic habitant *Drosera villosa* (Albino *et al.* 2006) and desert growing *Lasiurus* grass (Chowdhury *et al.* 2009).

The beneficial roles of diazotrophs to plants include nitrogen-fixation, mineral solubilization, production of phyto hormones such as indole acetic acid (IAA) and cytokinins. By virtue of such attributes, pre-treatment of seeds with a suspension of Azotobacter was shown to improve seed germination and plant growth (Ravikumar et al. 2004). An increasing supply of N through dinitrogen fixation may increase crop production in saline habitats (Yao et al. 2010). Diazotrophic bacteria are also PGPR, because of their competitive advantage in C-rich and Npoor environments (Kennedy et al. 2004). Several reports revealed that inoculation with free living diazotrophs like Azotobacter, Pseudomonas and Azosp. irillum increased the yield of rice by 20-55% (Mirza et al. 2006) and a strain of diazotrophic Burkholderia increased the rice plant biomass by 69% (Kennedy et al. 2004). Some isolations including genus Pseudomonas and Bacillus have been shown to have capacity to promote the wheat growth in salinated soils of Uzbekistan (Nautiyal et al. 2008). In other work, Palomino et al. (2009) reported that Bacillus subtilis is a Gram-positive sporulating bacterium able to adapt to wide variations in osmotic and saline strength. Studies

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: saratha6@gmail.com

showed that inoculation with *Azosp.irillum* spp. increased plant growth and the K<sup>+</sup>/Na<sup>+</sup> ratio of two maize cultivars (Hamdia *et al.* 2004). Moreover, Yao *et al* (2010) reported that inoculation with *Pseudomonas putida* promoted cotton growth and germination under conditions of salt stress. Considering the efficacy, input cost and environmental safety, use of chemical fertilizers for crop production in saline soil is not a sound proposition.

The objective of this study was to identify the multifaceted growth promoting salt tolerant diazotrophs from the rhizosphere of *Cynodon dactylon* and their effect on rice seedling in the presence and absence of salt stress under pot culture conditions.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Isolation and screening of growth promoting diazotrophs

The soil samples were collected from the rhizosphere of *C. dactylon* at salinity affected agricultural fields of Trichy district, Tamilnadu on March, 2012. Diazotrophic microorganisms isolated using serial dilution technique ( $10^{6}$  dilution) on selective N-free malate medium (NFM) (Piao *et al.* 2005) with 1% (w/v) NaCl concentration. After required incubation period, colonies growing on N-free media were counted and grouped according to their morphological characteristics. Single colonies from rhizosphere soil samples picked from NFM plates and sub-cultured several times in same medium to obtain pure cultures and stored as glycerol stocks at -20° C. The salt tolerances of diazotrophic bacterial isolates were determined on free nitrogen media supplemented with different NaCl concentrations of 0-10%.

#### Identification of diazotrophs by 16S rRNA gene sequencing

Nearly full-length of 16S rRNA gene was amplified from elite isolates as described earlier using universal eubacterial primers, FD1 and RP2 (Weisburg *et al.* 1991) and the band of expected size was gel-purified using spin columns (Bangalore genei, India) according to the manufacturer's instructions and cloned using PGMT vector supplied with TA cloning kit (Promega, USA) prior to sequencing. Sequencing reactions were performed using ABI prism terminator cycle sequencing ready reaction kit and electrophoresis of the products were carried out on an Applied Biosystems (Model 3100) automated sequencer. The identity of 16S rDNA sequence was established by performing a similarity search against the GenBank database (http://www.ncbi.nih.gov/BLAST).

#### Plant growth promoting features of isolates

Plant growth-promoting capabilities of the selected strains were studied in the presence and absence of NaCl (nitrogen fixation, phosphate solubilization, indole acetic acid, acc d synthesis and siderophore production). The nitrogen fixing capacity of the diazotrophic isolates was evaluated by estimating the acetylene reduction activity (ARA) (Bergersen 1980) using gas chromatograph (Chemito-7610) equipped with FID detector and Porapak N column (2m x 1/8"). Temperatures such as injector, detector, and column were maintained at 110°C, 120°C and 73°C, respectively. Nitrogen gas was used as carrier gas at the flow rate of 30 ml/min. After completion of ARA, the bacterial cells in the medium were evenly mixed and the protein concentration was measured (Lowry et al.1951). ARA results were expressed as n mole ethylene /mg/protein/h. An aliquot was taken from each pure culture for evaluation of plant growth promoting characteristics indole acetic acid (IAA) production was done using the method of Chandramohan and Mahadevan (1968). Solubilization of insoluble phosphates (Bunt and Rovira 1955) were also assayed. Siderophore production was checked using the Chrome Azurol S (CAS) agar plates (Dubey and Maheshwari 2004). ACC deaminase activity was measured by measuring the production of á-Ketobutyrate as described by Honma and Shimomura (1978).

# Effects of NaCl and bacterial inoculation on rice growth

Pot experiments were conducted in order to evaluate the effect of NaCl and bacterial inoculation on growth of rice. Pots containing 400 g of dry-sterilized soil were supplemented to reach 0, 2.9 and 5.8 g NaCl/kg soil, which was prepared by adding 0, 1.08 and 2.25 g NaCl dissolved in 100 mL water. The treatment without exogenous addition of NaCl was considered as 0 g NaCl/kg soil concentration. Characteristics of the soil without added salt were pH (1:5 water)- 6.5, EC- 1.50 dS /m, organic matter -15 g /kg, available N-289 kg/ha, P-18.92 kg/ha, potassium -134.34 kg/ha. Dehulled rice seeds var. ADT43 were disinfected by soaking in 30% hydrogen peroxide and 70% ethanol for 10 min, and followed by rinsing several times in sterilized distilled water. The seeds were then pre-germinated in sterilized plain agar at room conditions for five days. For inoculum preparation, bacteria were grown in nutrient broth for 24 h at 37°C, rinsed twice, and finally resuspended to the same initial volume using phosphate buffer pH7.0. Roots of seedlings, with the same size, were

submerged three times in bacterial suspension adjusted to  $OD_{600} = 1$  and planted in each pot supplemented or not with NaCl. Seedlings submerged in sterilized water were used as a control. Biometric observations such as plant height and dry matter production were taken at 4 weeks after the inoculation. In addition, chlorophyll content of rice leaves was estimated by the method of Hiscox and Israelstam (1979).

#### **Inorganic elements**

Leaf tissues were separated after harvesting and airdried at 70°C for 5 days. Dried materials were ground and then digested in  $H_2SO_4$  for the determination of total nitrogen (Kjeldahl method) or in a ternary solution (HNO<sub>3</sub>:  $H_2SO_4$ : HClO<sub>4</sub> = 10:1:4 with volume) for the determination of P, K and Na (Mani *et al.* 2007).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In the present study 18 pure cultures of diazotrophic organisms were isolated from saline soils and tested for tolerance of NaCl. Among the isolates tested, isolates C2 and C4 tolerated a higher content of NaCl (10%) than other isolates (Fig. 1). Due to their high tolerances, TRY2 and TRY4 were selected for further studies. Identification of isolates based on phenotypical and physiological criteria however was difficult, if the features displayed by a particular isolate are not fully identical with a described species. Utilization of PGPB has become a promising alternative to alleviate plant stress caused by salinity (Fu et al. 2010). Thus the molecular based method, 16S rDNA sequence analysis, was therefore chosen to identify the selected isolates. The isolates were identified as Serratia sp. (TRY2) and Bacillus sp. (TRY4) within the order Enterobateriales and Firmicutes, respectively (Table 1).

Table 1. Molecular characteristics of selected isolates

| Code of<br>the isolate | Length of<br>16sr DNA<br>sequence (bp) | Most closely<br>related<br>organism | Similarity<br>(%) |
|------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| TR Y2                  | 1540                                   | <i>Serratia</i> sp.                 | 99                |
| TRY4                   | 1469                                   | Bacillus sp.                        | 99                |

#### Plant growth-promoting features

The isolates *Serratia* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. were able to reduce acetylene in both the presence and absence of NaCl. In the present study, the nitrogenase enzyme activity of the isolates ranged from  $114 \pm 4.63$  to  $136 \pm 7.92$  n moles of ethylene/mg of protein/h. The highest nitrogenase activity was exhibited by isolate *Bacillus* sp. with 2.9g NaCl concentration (136±7.92 n moles of ethylene/ mg of protein/ h) (Table 2).



Fig. 1. Maximum salt tolerance level of diazotrophic isolates

The microbial synthesis of plant growth regulators is an important factor in soil fertility. Salt-tolerant IAAproducing bacterial strains *P. aureantiaca* and *P. extremorientalis* alleviated quite successfully the reductive effect of salt stress on percentage of germination (up to 79%), probably through their ability to produce IAA (Egamberdieva *et al.* 2008). They were able to produce indole-3-acetic acid (IAA) in saline conditions. In the present study, the maximum amount of IAA was produced by *Bacillus* sp. (18.8  $\pm$ 1.0 µg/ml of sample) followed by *Serratia* sp. (14.8 $\pm$ 0.8 µg/ml of sample) with 2.9 g/l NaCl concentration (Table 2).

Diazotrophic microorganisms showing phosphate solubilizing activity have beenreported. (Mayak *et al.* 2004). Phosphate solubilization activity was exhibited by both strains *Serratia* sp and *Bacillus* sp (Table 2). In the present study, the maximum amount of siderophore was produced by isolate *Bacillus* sp and *Serratia* sp with 2.9 NaCl concentration which produced  $16.5\pm0.9$  and  $15.5\pm0.8 \mu g/ml$  of sample respectively. In other work, direct use of *P. putida* siderophores by plants has been demonstrated in many species, including dicot legumes such as peanut or monocots such as sorghum (Albino *et al.* 2006).

The results obtained demonstrated that the selected salt-tolerant bacterium containing ACC deaminase. *Pseudomonas fluorescens* strain TDK1 containing ACC deaminase activity enhanced the saline resistance in ground-nut plants and increased yield as compared to plants inoculated with *Pseudomonas* strains lacking ACC deaminase activity (Saravanakumar and Samiyappan 2007). In the present study, maximum amount of ACC observed in *Bacillus* sp. (89.8  $\pm$  1.1 nmoles of á-ketobutyrate /mg/h) followed by *Serratia* sp. (76.6  $\pm$  2.3 nmoles of á - ketobutyrate/mg/h) with 5.8g/l NaCl concentration (Table

| Strain              | NaCl<br>(g/l)   | <sup>1</sup> ARA   | <sup>2</sup> IAA  | <sup>2</sup> Phosphate solubilzation  | <sup>2</sup> Siderophore production   | <sup>3</sup> acc deaminase<br>activity  |
|---------------------|-----------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Serratia sp.        | 0<br>2.9<br>5.8 | $\frac{117(\pm 9.2)^{c}}{122(\pm 8.1)^{ab}}$ $\frac{118(\pm 7.1)^{c}}{2}$  | $\frac{11.7(\pm 1.2)^{ab}}{14.8(\pm 0.8)^{ab}}$ $10.3(\pm 0.9)^{b}$                         | $\begin{array}{c} 12.0(\pm0.9)^{ab} \\ 11.8(\pm0.7)^{ab} \\ 14.8\ (\pm1.2)^{a} \end{array}$           | $\frac{11.0(\pm 1.0)^{b}}{15.5(\pm 0.8)^{a}}$ $\frac{11.0(\pm 0.6)^{b}}{11.0(\pm 0.6)^{b}}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 13.9 \ (\pm 1.0)^{\rm d} \\ 34.8 \ (\pm 1.4)^{\rm c} \\ 76.6 \ (\pm 1.3)^{\rm b} \end{array}$ |
| <i>Bacillus</i> sp. | 0<br>2.9<br>5.8 | $114(\pm 4.6)^{ab}$<br>136 (±7.9) <sup>a</sup><br>123 (±5.2) <sup>ab</sup> | $\frac{11.8(\pm 0.8)^{b}}{18.8(\pm 1.0)^{a}}$ $\frac{10.8(\pm 1.0)^{b}}{10.8(\pm 1.0)^{b}}$ | $\begin{array}{c} 11.7 \ (\pm 0.9)^{ab} \\ 12.8 \ (\pm 0.7)^{ab} \\ 10.8 \ (\pm 1.0)^{b} \end{array}$ | $\frac{12.5(\pm 0.8)^{b}}{16.5(\pm 0.9)^{a}}$ $10.5(\pm 1.0)^{b}$                           | $\begin{array}{c} 14.9 \ (\pm 1.2)^{d} \\ 45.8 \ (\pm 1.1)^{c} \\ 109.8 (\pm 1.2)^{a} \end{array}$              |

Table 2. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria (PGPR) features of strains

ARA: Acetylene reduction activity; IAA: Indole acetic acid; Values are mean ( $\pm$  standard error) (n=3) and values followed by the same letter in each column are not significantly different from each other as determined by DMRT (p≤0.05). <sup>1</sup>n moles of ethylene/ mg of protein/h, <sup>2</sup>µg/ml of sample, <sup>3</sup>n moles of a-ketobutyrate/mg/h



Fig 2. Effect of NaCl and diazotrophic PGPR on a) plant height, b) plant dry matter production and C) chlorophyll content of rice seedlings

2). In other work, *Pseudomonas putida* UW4, which produces IAA and ACC deaminase, protected canola seedling from growth inhibition by high levels of salt (Mayak *et al.* 2004).

#### Rice growth and nutrient uptake

Electrical conductivities were 3.05 and 6.00 dS/m for 2.9 and 5.8 g NaCl/kg soil, respectively. Inoculation with strains Serratia sp. and Bacillus sp. increased plant growth, both normal and under saline stress. Similar work conducted by Mayak et al. (2004) that Achromobacter piechaudii having ACC deaminase activity significantly increased the fresh and dry weights of tomato seedlings grown in the presence of NaCl salt (up to 172 mM). In the present study, the treatment inoculation with strain Bacillus sp. in 1.5 g NaCl/kg soil, the increase in plant height (28.9 $\pm$  1.3cm) and dry matter production (0.8 g) (Fig. 2). Salinity decreases carbon uptake by limiting photosynthesis, causing an over-reduction of photosynthetic electron chain, and redirecting the photon energy into processes that favour the production of reactive oxygen species (ROS) (Hichem et al. 2009). In our study, the maximum total chlorophyll ( $1.8\pm0.3$  mg) was observed in Serratia sp. with 2.9 NaCl g/kg. Diazotrophs may become selectively enriched to promote plant growth because of their competitive advantage in C-rich and N poor environments (Kennedy et al. 2004). Hence inoculation with diazotrophic bacteria might improve crop growth and productivity in such soils.

The PGPR strains varied greatly in their effect on the concentration of major mineral nutrients in rice leaves under soil salinity conditions. The N, P, K, and Na uptake per plant in the soil salinity treatment were significantly decreased compared to the non-salinity treatment (Fig. 3). The concentration of major cations in the non-salinity treatment was increased more with the PGPR treatment (*Serratia* sp. and *Bacillus* sp.) than the control, but Na<sup>+</sup>





Fig. 3 Effect of NaCl and diazotrophic PGPR on uptake N, P, K and Na

uptake under soil salinity were decreased in the treatment inoculated with (*Serratia* sp.) and (*Bacillus* sp.) strains. Among the isolates, *Bacillus* sp. caused a lower uptake of Na (22.5  $\pm$  0.6 mg) compared to *Serratia* sp. (Fig. 3). Our findings clearly showed that two isolates of *Serratia* sp. and *Bacillus* sp. were capable of exerting multifaceted beneficial plant-growth promoting activities under moderate saline conditions. These isolates could serve as potential bioinoculants for meeting the nutritional requirement of the crop plants in an eco-friendly and cost effective manner in saline soil conditions.

#### REFERENCES

- Albino U, Saridakis DP, Ferreira MC, Hungria M, Vinuesa P and Andrade G. 2006. High diversity of diazotrophic bacteria with carnivorous plant *Drosera villosa* var. *villosa* growing in oligotrophic habitats in Brazil. *Plant and Soil* 287: 199–207.
- Bagwell CE and Lovell CR. 2000. Microdiversity of culturable diazotrophs from the rhizoplanes of the salt marsh grasses *Sp.artina alterniflora* and *Juncus roemerianus*. *Microbial Ecology* **39**: 128–136.
- Bunt JS and Rovira AD. 1955. Microbiological studies of some subantartic soils. *Journal of Soil Science* 6:119–128.
- Chandramohan D and Mahadevan A .1968. Indole acetic acid metabolism in soils. *Current Science* **37**:112-113.
- Chowdhury SP, Schmid M, Hartmann A and Tripathi AK. 2009. Diversity of 16S-rRNA and nifH genes derived from rhizosphere soil and roots of an endemic drought tolerant grass, *Lasiurus sindicus. European Journal Soil Biology* **45**:114–122.
- Dubey RC and Maheshwari DK. 2004. *Practical Microbiology*. S. Chand and company Ltd., New Delhi.
- Egamberdieva D, Kamilova F, Validov S, Gafurova L, Kucharova Z and Lugtenberg B. 2008. High incidence of plant growth-stimu-

lating bacteria associated with the rhizosphere of wheat grown on salinated soil in Uzbekistan. *Environmental Microbiology* **10**:1–9.

- Fu Q, Liu C, Ding N, Lin Y and Guo B. 2010. Ameliorative effects of inoculation with the plant growth-promoting rhizobacterium *Pseudomonas* sp.. DW1 on growth of eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.) seedlings under salt stress. *Agricultural Water Management* 97: 1994–2000.
- Hamdia MA, Shaddad ES and Doaa MAK. 2004. Mechanisms of salt tolerance and interactive effects of *Azosp.irillum brasilense* inoculation on maize cultivars grown under salt stress conditions. *Plant Growth Regulators* 44: 165–174.
- Hichem H, Mounir D and Naceur EA. 2009. Differential responses of two maize (*Zea mays* L.) varieties to salt stress: changes on polyphenols composition of foliage and oxidative damages. *Indian Crop Production* **30**: 144–151.
- Hiscox JD and Israelstam GF. 1979. A method for the extraction of chlorophyll from leaf tissue without maceration. *Canadian Journal of Botany* **57**: 1332–1334.
- Honma M and Shimomura T. 1978. Metabolism of 1aminocyclopropane-1-carboxylic acid. *Agricultural Biology and Chemistry* **42**: 1825–1831.
- Kennedy IR, Choudhury ATMA and Kecskes ML. 2004. Free-living bacterial diazotrophs in crop-farming systems: can their potential for plant growth promotion be better exploited? *Soil Biology and Biochemistry* 4: 1229–1244.
- Loganathan P and Nair S. 2004. Swaminathania salitolerans gen. nov., sp. nov., a salt-Tolerant nitrogen-fixing and phosphatesolubilizing bacterium from wild rice (Porteresia coarctata Tateoka). International Journal Systematic Evolutionary Microbiology 54:199–204.
- Mayak S, Tirosh T and Glick B. 2004. Plant growth-promoting bacteria confer resistance in tomato plants to salt stress. *Plant Physiology and Biochemistry* **42**: 565–572.

Saline tolerant plant growth promoting diazotrophs from rhizosphere of bermuda grass and their effect on rice

- Mani AK, Santhi R and Sellamuthu KM. 2007. A Hand Book of Laboratory Analysis. A.E.Publications, Coimbatore.
- Mirza MS, Mehnaz S, Normand P, Prigent-Combaret C, Moënne-Loccoz Y and Bally R. 2006. Molecular characterization and PCR detection of a nitrogen-fixing *Pseudomonas* strain promoting rice growth. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 43: 163–70.
- Munns R and Tester M. 2005. Mechanisms of salinity tolerance. Annual Review of Plant Biology **59**: 651–681.
- Nautiyal CS, Govindarajan R, Lavania M and Pushpangadan P. 2008. Novel mechanism of modulating natural antioxidants in functional foods: involvement of plant growth promoting Rhizobacteria NRRL B-30488. Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry 56: 4474–4481.
- Palomino MM, Sanchez-Rivas C and Ruzal SM. 2009. High salt stress in *Bacillus subtilis*: involvement of PBP4 as a peptidoglycan hydrolase. *Journal of Research Microbiology* **160**: 117-124.
- Parida AK and Das AB. 2005. Salt tolerance and salinity effects on plants: a review. *Ecotoxicology Environmental Saftey* 60: 324– 349.
- Piao Z,Cui Z, Yin B, Hu J, Zhou C, Xie G, Su B. and Yin S. 2005. Changes in acetylene reduction activities and effects of inocu-

lated rhizosphere nitrogen-fixing bacteria on rice. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* **41**: 371–378.

- Ravikumar S, Kathiresan K, Ignatiammal STM, Selvam MB and Shanthy S. 2004. Nitrogen-fixing *Azotobacters* from mangrove habitat and their utility as marine biofertilizers. J *Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* **312**: 5–17.
- Saravanakumar D and Samiyappan R. 2007. ACC deaminase from *Pseudomonas fluorescens* mediated saline resistance in groundnut (*Arachis hypogea*) plants. *Journal of Applied Microbiology* **102:** 1283-1292.
- Sziderics AH, Rasche F, Trognitz F, Sessitsch A. and Wilhelm E .2007. Bacterial endophytes contribute to abiotic stress adaptation in pepper plants (*Capsicum annuum* L.). *Canadian Journal of Botany Microbiology* 53: 1195–1202.
- Weisburg WG, Barns SM, Pelletier DA and Lane DJ. 1991.16S ribosomal DNA amplification for phylogenetic study. *Journal of Bacteriology* 173: 697–703.
- Yao L, Wu Z, Zheng Y, Kaleem I and Li C. 2010. Growth promotion and protection against salt stress by *Pseudomonas putida* Rs-198 on cotton. *European Journal of Soil Biology* **46**: 49–54.

# Efficacy of clodinafop, isoproturon and their sequential application on *durum* wheat as influenced by fertilizer application

## **Tayyeb Farag Hessain\***

Crop Sciences Department, Omar Mokhtar University, Libya

Received: 11 March 2013; Revised: 1 June 2013

#### ABSTRACT

Field experiments were conducted in Safsaf area in Libya during growing season of 2009-10 and 2010-11. The field infested with many weeds of mixed flora was used to investigate the efficacy of clodinafop, isoproturon and their sequential application in '*Zorda*' cultivar of *durum* wheat during different crop growth stages that is seedling, tillering and elongation in the presence or absence of diammonium phosphate (DAP) at 2.5 t/ha. Results revealed that all weed control treatments reduced weed density and dry weight recorded at 60 days of sowing. The least weed density was recorded from sequential application of clodinafop and isoproturon compared to weedy check. Herbicide application at seedling stage of crop growth in the absence of DAP was more effective in reducing weeds density and their dry weight. Crop height, effective tillers, biological yield, grain and straw yield, seed and harvest index increased due to sequential application of clodinafop and isoproturon during seedling stage in the presence of DAP compared to weedy check and elongation stage in the absence of DAP.

Key words: Clodinafop, Chemical control, Durum wheat, Isoproturon, Sequential application

*Durum* wheat (*Triticum durum* L.) occupies prime position among the food crops of Libya which is grown in the Jabal El-Akhdar in an area of 42,000 ha with an average production of 1.2 t/ha (Tayyeb 2003). It is usually grown in areas where irrigation facilities are comparatively less (rainfed farming). The better grain yield realization is not possible without proper weed management in this crop, because weeds compete with the crop for nutrient, water, space and sunlight. The yield reduction in *durum* wheat depends upon the type and density of associated weed flora (Singh *et al.* 1997, Singh and Yadav 1998, Bhat *et al.* 2006). Among the grass weeds, wild oat (*Avena fatua*) can cause yield reduction from 15-50% (Singh *et al.* 1995a, Walia and Brar 2001, Anon. 2009).

There are several weed species infesting wheat (Singh *et al.* 1995b) with large potential to lower crop yields due to severe competition. Weed stage, herbicide rates and fertilizers application impact weed control and crop-weed competition (Singh *et al.* 1995a, Singh *et al.* 1997, Balyan *et al.* 2000, Bhat *et al.* 2006). Herbicide efficacy can be increased by tank mixing, if compatible (Sharma *et al.* 2002, Singh *et al.* 2011) or their sequential application (bromoxynil and diclofop-methyl) for effective control of weed flora in wheat (Tayyeb 2012). Compatibility of herbicides depends on mixture partners (Yadav *et al.* 2009), but isoprouron has been found compatible with both grassy and broad-

\*Corresponding author: proftayyebfarag@gmail.com

leaved herbicides (Singh *et al.* 1993) and can be used as tank mix or in sequence. Clodinafop which is effective against wild oat and isoproturon for grasses and broadleaved weeds have recently been introduced in Libya. The present experiment was conducted to study the effect of sequential application of clodinafop and isoproturon in managing weeds of rain-fed *durum* wheat when applied at different crop stages in the presence or absence of fertilizer.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiments were conducted at the research farm of Agriculture Research Center in Safsaf (22° 46 ' N, 32° 39' E, 490 MSL), Libya during 2009-10 and 2010-11. The soil of the experimental field was deep silty loam, typic lithic xerochrepts, low in organic carbon and slightly alkaline (pH 7.8). The region has a cold winter suited for wheat. Average annual rainfall was 521 to 561 mm. The experiment field was infested with mixed population of Avena fatua, Bromus tectorum, Lolium multiflorum, Medicago sp., Brassica tournefortii, Chenopodium album, Anagallis arvensis and Convolvulus arvensis. The weed control treatments were clodinafop at 280 g/ha, isoproturon at 1.2 kg/ha and their sequential application at the above rates along with weedy check treatment. Spraying was done at the 2-3 leaf stage of crop (S1), tillering stage (S2) and elongation stage (S3) in the presence of diamonium phosphate (DAP) fertilizer at 250 kg/ha (F1) or without fertilization (F0).

The experiment was conducted in a split plot design with four replications. The durum wheat cultivar '*Zorda*' [Gerardo V Z 469 – AA "S" – CM 363 – 5M - 4Y – 3M – OY ] was sown using 90 kg/ha seed on 11 and 15 November in 2009 and 2010, respectively. The herbicides were in the main plots, time of herbicidal application in the subplots and fertilizer in the sub-sub-plot in a plot size of 5.2 x 2.4 m. The data on weed density were recorded 60 days after sowing (DAS) using 50 x 50 cm quadrant. The plant height, effective tillers/m, biological yield, grain and straw yield (t/ha), harvest index, weed dry matter of both grass and broad-leaved weeds were recorded at the time of harvest. Data were submitted to analysis of variance with least significant differences test (P < 0.05).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Weed density

All weed control treatments reduced weed density significantly at 60 DAS than the weedy check (Table 1). The minimum grass weed density was recorded in sequential application during both the seasons compared to the control. Effect of time of application during different crop growth stages was not significantly different on the grassy weed density during the first season, however, during the second season, highly significant differences were apparent due to sequential application when applied at the seedling stage. Moreover, grassy weed density was significantly reduced by herbicides in the presence of DAP fertilizer. The interaction of herbicides and crop growth stages was highly significant during both the years. There was a highly significant difference in grassy weed density due to interaction of stage of crop growth and fertilizer for grassy weeds density during 2009-10 and 2010-11, and a highly significant effect of interaction of herbicide x stage of crop growth x fertilizer on grassy weed density in the season 2010-11.

The broad-leaved weeds density recorded significant variations due to herbicidal treatment. Sequential application gave the least density in the first season, but there was no significant effect in the broad-leaved weeds density due to different crop growth stages in both the seasons (Table 1). The fertilizer (DAP) significantly increased broad-leaved weeds density compared to no fertilization during both the seasons. The interaction of herbicide and fertilizer in the first season was highly significant. Good broad-leaved weeds control was also reported by Sharma *et al.* (2002) by tank mix applications of isoproturon with chlorsulfuron.

#### Weeds dry weight

Total weeds (grassy + broad-leaved) dry weight was significantly decreased due to weed control treatments. The least dry weight of 0.54, 0.01 kg/m<sup>2</sup> was recorded from sequential application of clodinafop and isoproturon compared to the weedy check  $(1.63, 2.33 \text{ kg/m}^2)$  for both the seasons (Table 2). Minimum weed dry weight 0.51 kg/m<sup>2</sup> was statistically significant due to weed control at seedling stage in 2<sup>nd</sup> season. However, weedy dry wet was statistically on par with all stages of crop growth in the first season (Table 2). Total weed dry weight was not affected by the application of fertilizer during both the seasons, which might be due to poor control of broadleaved weeds in the herbicide treated plots. Meanwhile, the interaction (herbicides x time of application) effect in weed dry wet was independent because of significant differences and only herbicide x stage of application was significant during the first season.

## Effect on crop

Crop plant height was significantly more in the first year of study due to application of herbicides over weedy check, but the differences were non-significant during second year (Table 2). Similarly, application of herbicides at the seedling stage resulted in taller plants, but only dur-

# Table 1. Weeds density as affected by herbicidal treat-<br/>ments at different wheat crop growth stages<br/>in the presence or absence of DAP fertilizer

| Treatment             |            | weeds<br>/m <sup>2</sup> ) | Broad-<br>weeds (i |         |
|-----------------------|------------|----------------------------|--------------------|---------|
|                       | 2009-10    | 2010-11                    | 2009-10            | 2010-11 |
| Herbicides (H)        |            |                            |                    |         |
| Clodinafop            | 3.5        | 3.0                        | 9.2                | 8.4     |
| Isoproturon           | 7.0        | 6.8                        | 3.2                | 8.2     |
| Clodinafsop fb        | 2.2        | 2.9                        | 2.5                | 8.5     |
| isoproturon           |            |                            |                    |         |
| Weedy check           | 11.2       | 12.8                       | 9.7                | 8.9     |
| LSD (P=005)           | 0.9        | 0.6                        | 2.3                | NS      |
| Time of application ( | stage of g | rowth) (S)                 |                    |         |
| Seedling              | 6.8        | 6.2                        | 8.5                | 8.8     |
| Tillering             | 7.3        | 5.8                        | 8.3                | 8.4     |
| Elongation            | 6.9        | 5.4                        | 7.9                | 8.3     |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | NS         | 0.54                       | NS                 | NS      |
| Fertilization by DA   | P(F)       |                            |                    |         |
| Unfertilized          | 8.1        | 6.4                        | 7.5                | 9.5     |
| Fertilized            | 5.9        | 5.3                        | 4.8                | 7.5     |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | 1.4        | 0.1                        | 0.4                | 0.2     |
| Interactions          |            |                            |                    |         |
| H X S                 | *          | **                         | NS                 | NS      |
| НХF                   | **         | **                         | **                 | NS      |
| S X F                 | *          | NS                         | NS                 | **      |
| H X S X F             | NS         | **                         | NS                 | NS      |

#### Tayyeb Farag Hessain

| Treatment                         | Plant he | ight (cm) |         | reed dry<br>t (t/ha) | Effective tillers (no./ m <sup>2</sup> ) |         |  |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-----------|---------|----------------------|--|---------|--|
|                                   | 2009-10  | 2010-11   | 2009-10 | 2010-11              | 2009-10                                  | 2010-11 |  |
| Herbicides                        |          |           |         |                      |  |         |  |
| Clodinafop                        | 44.5     | 59.0      | 8       | 3                    | 73                                       | 66      |  |
| Isoproturon                       | 44.9     | 62.8      | 6       | 1                    | 81                                       | 76      |  |
| Clodinafop <i>fb</i> isoprooturon | 40.6     | 63.5      | 5       | 0                    | 96                                       | 88      |  |
| Weedy check                       | 31.8     | 61.6      | 16      | 23                   | 66                                       | 51      |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)                      | 7.93     | NS        | 2       | 2                    | 9  | 9       |  |
| Crop growth stage at spraying     |          |           |         |                      |  |         |  |
| Seedling (S1)                     | 48.5     | 57.1      | 8       | 5                    | 1.1                                      | 80      |  |
| Tillering (S2)                    | 37.3     | 63.5      | 8       | 6                    | 68                                       | 73      |  |
| Elongation (S3)                   | 35.5     | 58.6      | 10      | 10                   | 68                                       | 51      |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)                      | 6.6      | NS        | 1       | 1                    | 9  | 6       |  |
| Fertilization                     |          |           |         |                      |  |         |  |
| Unfertilized                      | 42.9     | 62.2      | 7       | 6                    | 75                                       | 58      |  |
| Fertilized                        | 38.0     | 61.1      | 7       | 7                    | 83                                       | 77      |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)                      | NS       | NS        | NS      | NS                   | 5  | 5       |  |

Table 2. Effect of herbicides, stage of spraying and DAP fertilization on crop and weeds

fb = followed by, NS=Not Significant; \* =Significant (P<0.05); \*\* = Highly significant (P<0.01).

ing the first season. Effect of DAP fertilization was nonsignificant on plant height in both the seasons (Table 2). Two or three way interactions were non-significant except herbicide x stage during the first season.

Effective tillers are the main yield attributing characters which were significantly influenced by the weed control treatments. Maximum tillers density of 96 and 88 was recorded in the sequential application of clodinafop followed by isoproturon compared to 66 and 51 in the check (Table 2). Among herbicides, lowest tillers were recorded with alone application of clodinafop which may be due to no control of broad-leaved weeds. Time of herbicidal application significantly effected the effective tillers in both the years of study, highest being at seedling stage. DAP fertilizer increased tillers significantly compared to no fertilizer application. All the interactions were significant except fertilizer and stage of application.

The biological yield was highly significant due to herbicided treatments and time of application in the two seasons of the study (Table 3). Maximum bio-yield 1.84, 3.3 t/ha were recorded due to sequential application compared to the check treatments 1.5 and 0.9 t/ha during 2010 and 2011, respectively. Herbicide application at seedling stage produced 1.8 and 3.2 t/ha biological yield compared to spraying at elongation stage (1.5 and 0.9 t/ha during 2010 and 2011, respectively). The DAP fertilization was not effective in the biological yield during both the years of study. All the treatments of clodinafop, isoproturon and their sequential application and the check were statistically at par with each other in respect of grain yield during the second year which was observed during first year. The same response regarding to the effect of the time of herbicides application in the presence or absent of DAP and the trial factors interaction was recorded in both the seasons. Whereas, straw yield under herbicidal treatments and time of application was significantly more than the check treatment when applied at 2-3 leaves stage of crop stage. The higher straw yield in sequential herbicidal application might be due to better weed control which ultimately increased the yield attributes without no effect of DAP application on the straw yield in 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the study.

Harvest index was significantly affected due to varying herbicides treatment and time of application in 2<sup>nd</sup> season. Harvest index was higest by sequential application of clodinafop and isoproturon at the S1 stage of crop growth without effect of DAP application in both the seasons. Sequential application of clodinafop 280 g in 500 l water/ha and isoproturon 1.2 l in 500 l water/ha was compatible and there was no adverse effect on efficacy of both the herbicides against complex weed flora and grain yields of wheat, however, these herbicides alone or sequential will not be effective where resistance weeds are prevalent. Efficacy of clodinafop, isoproturon and their sequential application on durum wheat as influenced by fertilizer application

|                                  | Biological | yield (t/ha) | Grain yie | eld (t/ha) | Straw yie | eld (t/ha) | Harvest i | ndex (%) |
|----------------------------------|------------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|----------|
| Treatment                        | 2009-10    | 2010-11      | 2009-10   | 2010-11    | 2009-10   | 2010-11    | 2009-10   | 2010-11  |
| Herbicides                       |            |              |           |            |           |            |           |          |
| Clodinafop                       | 1.6        | 2.8          | 0.50      | 0.62       | 1.1       | 2.1        | 29        | 22       |
| Isoproturon                      | 1.9        | 2.9          | 0.41      | 0.66       | 1.5       | 2.2        | 21        | 23       |
| Clodinafop <i>fb</i> isoproturon | 1.8        | 3.3          | 0.42      | 0.74       | 1.4       | 2.9        | 23        | 22       |
| Weedy check                      | 1.5        | 1.9          | 0.43      | 0.21       | 1.1       | 0.6        | 27        | 11       |
| LSD (P=0.05)                     | 0.1        | 0.4          | NS        | 0.20       | NS        | 0.6        | 0.0       | 0.1      |
| Crop growth stage at spraying    | r          |              |           |            |           |            |           |          |
| Seedling                         | 1.8        | 3.2          | 0.45      | 0.74       | 1.4       | 2.5        | 24        | 23       |
| Tillering                        | 1.8        | 2.9          | 0.43      | 0.58       | 1.4       | 2.4        | 23        | 19       |
| Elongation                       | 1.5        | 0.9          | 0.39      | 0.30       | 1.1       | 0.6        | 25        | 32       |
| LSD (P=0.05)                     | 0.0        | 0.3          | NS        | NS         | 0.0       | 0.8        | NS        | 8        |
| Fertilization                    |            |              |           |            |           |            |           |          |
| Unfertilized                     | 1.7        | 2.4          | 0.43      | 0.83       | 1.3       | 1.6        | 25        | 33       |
| Fertilized                       | 1.7        | 2.7          | 2.76      | 0.84       | 1.3       | 1.9        | 26        | 30       |
| LSD (P=0.05)                     | NS         | NS           | NS        | NS         | NS        | NS         | NS        | NS       |

Table 3. Effect of herbicides, stage of spraying and DAP fertilization on wheat yield

#### REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 2009. Workshop on weed risk assessment, 22-25 March, 2009, El-Baida, Libya.
- Balyan RS, Samunder Singh, Malik RK and Dhankar RS. 2000. Rate and time of application of chlorsulfuron for broad-leaved weed control in wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 32: 173-176.
- Bhat MA, Mahal SS, Kumar Krishnan and Mahey RK. 2006. Effect of nitrogen levels, irrigation regimes and weed control methods on competitiveness of bed planted *durum* wheat (*Triticum durum* Desf.) with *Phalaris minor* Retz. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 38: 233-236.
- Sharma R, Pahuja SS, Balyan RS and Malik RK. 2002. Effect of sulfonylurea herbicides applied alone and tank mix with metribuzin on weeds and their residual effect on succeeding crop of sorghum. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **34**: 178-183.
- Singh Kuldeep, Malik RS, Kumar Satish and Panwar RS. 1997. Effect of sowing dates and herbicides in controlling weeds in *durum* wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **29**: 205-206.
- Singh Samar, Malik RK, Bishnoi LK and Singh Samunder. 1993. Effect of tank mixture of isoproturon and tralkoxydim on the control of *Phalaris minor* in wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 25: 11-13.
- Singh Samunder, Malik RK, Balyan RS and Singh Samar. 1995b. Distribution of weed flora of wheat in Haryana. *Indian Journal* of Weed Science **27**: 114-121.

- Singh Samunder, Malik RK, Panwar RS and Balyan RS. 1995a. Influence of sowing time on the winter wild oat (Avena ludoviciana) control in wheat (Triticum aestivum) with isoproturon. Weed Science 43: 370-374.
- Singh Samunder, Punia SS, Yadav Ashok and Hooda VS. 2011. Evaluation of carfentrazone-ethyl + metsulfuron-methyl against broad-leaved weeds of wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 43: 12-22.
- Singh Tejinder and Yadav SK. 1998. Effect of irrigation and herbicides on weed control and yield of *durum* wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **30**: 136-140.
- Tayyeb FH. 2003. Effect of planting methods on growth and yield of wheat crop in El-Gabal Akhdaar, Libya. *Journal of Advanced Research Alex* 8(4): 829-843.
- Tayyeb FH. 2012. Compatibility sequential application of brominal with Illoxan to control a complex weed flora in *durum* wheat. *Journal of Agricultural Research Alex.* (in press).
- Walia US and Brar LS. 2001. Competitive ability of wild oat and broad leaf weeds in relation to crop density and nitrogen levels. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 33: 120-123.
- Yadav DB, Kumar Ashok, Singh Samunder and Lal Roshan. 2009. Compatibility of fenoxaprop-P-ethyl with carfentrazone ethyl and metsulfuron-methyl and 2,4-D for controlling complex weeds of wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **41**: 157-160.

Indian Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 90–92, 2013

# Bioefficacy of pinoxaden in combination with other herbicides against complex weed flora in wheat

Suman Shoeran, S.S. Punia\*, Ashok Yadav and Samunder Singh

Department of Agronomy, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana 125 004

Received: 26 February 2013; Revised: 27 May 2013

#### ABSTRACT

An experiment to evaluate the bioefficacy of pinoxaden in combination with broad-leaved herbicides 2,4-D, metsulfuron and carfentrazone in wheat was conducted at Hisar during 2006-07 and 2007-08. Dominant weed flora of the experimental fields were *Phalaris minor* among grassy weeds and *Chenopodium album*, *Melilotus indicia* and *Rumex dentatus* among broad-leaved weeds. The tank mix application of pinoxaden with broad-leaved herbicides proved significantly effective in reducing density and dry weight of weeds and gave 85-100 % control of broad-leaved and 100% control of *P. minor*. Tank mixing of carfentrazone with pinoxaden although caused injury in terms of yellowing of tips but injury symptoms disappeared within 15 days after spray and did not result in any detrimental effect on grain yield of wheat. Application of broad-leaved herbicides 7 days earlier than pinoxaden or 7 days after application of pinoxaden also proved effective in controlling *P. minor* and broad-leaved weeds. Tank mixture of 2,4-D with pinoxaden did not result any antagonistic effect as anticipated as is evident by number of spikes, plant height, and number of grains per panicle and grain yield with use of 2,4-D were at par with weed free check.

Key words: Antagonism, Carfentrazone, Metsulfuron, Pinoxaden, Tank mixture, 2,4-D

Little seed canary grass (Phalaris minor), a problematic weed of wheat in rice-wheat cropping system in northwest India has developed resistance against isoproturon (Malik and Malik 1994, Malik and Singh 1995). To tackle the resistance problem, clodinafop, fenoxaprop and sulfosulfuron have been recommended for control of grassy weeds in wheat (Walia et.al.1998, Chhokar and Malik 2002). Continuous use of same herbicide for many years resulted in development of resistance against some weeds which happened in case of isoproturon. Therefore, alternate herbicides were needed to evaluate to tackle the resistance problem. Earlier studies conducted on cross resistance in Punjab and Haryana of isoproturon and alternate herbicides (clodinafop, fenoxaprop and sulfosulfuron) revealed that efficacy of clodinafop has decreased from 100% during 2004-05 to 78.1% during 2006-07 (Walia et al. 2007). In Haryana, GR<sub>50</sub> values of fenoxaprop and sulfosulfuron in 2002-03 have increased 6.2 and 2.3 times as compared to 1996-97 (Yadav and Malik 2007). The herbicide pinoxaden 5 EC at 40 - 50 g/ha was found very effective and recommended for the control of grassy weeds in wheat especially against clodinafop resistant P. minor biotypes without any residual toxicity to succeeding rice and sorghum crops (Walia et al. 2007, Punia et al. 2008, Punia and Yadav 2010).

Several broad-leaved weeds are becoming a serious problem along with grassy weeds in wheat. There is need for tank mix or sequential application of herbicides like 2,4-D, carfentrazone and metsulfuron for the control of complex weed flora. Tank mix application of 2,4-D with clodinafop and fenoxaprop gave reduced control of grassy weeds because of antagonism between 2,4-D and these grass weed killers (Banga and Yadav 2004, Punia *et al.* 2004, Yadav *et al.* 2010). Keeping this in view, efforts were made to explore the possibility of using pinoxaden in tank mixture with 2,4-D, metsulfuron and carfentrazone for satisfactory control of complex weed flora in wheat.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

An experiment to evaluate the bioefficacy of pinoxaden 5 EC in combination with broad-leaved weeds in wheat was conducted during *Kharif* and *Rabi* seasons of 2006-07 and 2007-08, at Agronomy Research Area of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar. The experimental soil was sandy loam (Typic Ustochrepts) with 61% sand, 22.1% silt and 19.1% clay, medium in fertility with 0.29% organic carbon and pH of 8.2. Wheat variety '*PBW*-343' was drilled on November 14, 2006 and November 5, 2007 during first and second year respectively, by FIRBS method, in a plot size of 6.0 x 2.1 m<sup>2</sup>, by using seed rate of 87.5 kg/ha. The study was arranged in randomized block

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: puniasatbir@gmail com

design and was replicated thrice. Recommended dose of fertilizers and irrigations were applied uniformly. The treatments comprising of pinoxaden 5 EC at 45 g/ha alone and in combination with metsulfuron, carfentrazone or 2,4-D as tank mixture, sequential application of these broadleaved herbicides before or after pinoxaden use at recommended rates were applied at 40 DAS by flat fan nozzle delivering 375 1/ha volume. Observations for weed population and their dry matter accumulation were recorded at 30 DAT with the help of random quadrate  $(0.5 \times 0.5 \text{ m})$ at four places in a plot and then converted into per m<sup>2</sup>. This data was subjected to square root  $(\sqrt{x+1})$  transformation to normalize their distribution before analysis. Data on per cent visual control by herbicides on 0-100 scale, yield attributes and grain yield was recorded at harvest which was statistically analyzed using analysis of variance.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Experimental field was infested with natural population of grassy (69%) and broad-leaved weeds (31%) during both the years. The dominant weeds were little seed canary grass (*P. minor*) among grassy weeds and common lambs quarters (*Chenopodium album*), yellow sweet clover (*Melilotus indica*) and golden dock (*Rumex dentatus*) were present as broad-leaved weeds.

#### Effect on weeds

The density and dry mater of weeds decreased significantly due to different herbicide treatments as compared to untreated check at 30 days after treatment (Table 1). Although pinoxaden at 45 g/ha provided excellent control (95-100%) of grassy weeds but did not show any efficacy against broad-leaved weeds as shown by density and biomass of weeds. The tank mix application of pinoxaden with broad-leaved herbicides proved significantly effective in reducing density and dry weight of weeds and gave 85-100 % control of broad-leaved and 100% control of *P. minor*. This is in conformity with the findings of Yadav *et al.* (2009). Tank mixture of 2,4-D with pinoxaden did not result any antagonistic effect as anticipated. Hence pinoxaden can safely be used as tank mix with 2,4-D, metsulfuron or carfentrazone with no loss of herbicide efficacy.

## Effect on crop

Tank mixing of carfentrazone with pinoxaden although caused injury in terms of yellowing of tips but injury symptoms disappeared within 15 days after spray and did not result in any detrimental effect on grain yield of wheat. Number of spikes, plant height, and number of grains per panicle and grain yield were significantly affected due to various herbicide treatments. Maximum Number of spikes per m.r.l. with tank mixture of pinoxaden + metsulfuron were 151 and 188, during 2006-07 and 2007-08, respectively and were statistically at par with all combinations of pinoxaden + 2,4-D, pinoxaden+ carfentrazone, or their sequential applications with pinoxaden and weed free treatment. Number of grains per panicle was maximum (49) in weed free, which were sta-

Table 1. Effect of herbicidal treatments on density and per cent control of weeds in wheat

|   |                |         | y of $P$ .<br>(no./m <sup>2</sup> ) |       | wt. of $a/m^2$ at | 1      | /isual co | ntrol (% | )     | Crop ii | njury at |
|---|----------------|---------|-------------------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|-----------|----------|-------|---------|----------|
| Treatment                               | Dose<br>(g/ha) |         | DAT                                 |       | g/m²) at<br>DAT   | Grassy | weeds     | BL       | LWs   | 10 1    | DAT      |
|   | (g/lid)        | 2006-   | 2007-                               | 2006- | 2007-             | 2006-  | 2007-     | 2006-    | 2007- | 2006-   | 2007-    |
|   |                | 07      | 08                                  | 07    | 08                | 07     | 08        | 07       | 08    | 07      | 08       |
| Pinoxaden                               | 45             | 1.4(1)  | 1 (0)                               | 12.9  | 17.6              | 95     | 100       | 0        | 0     | 0       | 0        |
| Pinoxaden + carfentrazone-ethyl         | 45 + 20        | 1(0)    | 1(0)                                | 3.5   | 3.2               | 100    | 100       | 85       | 87    | 5       | 3        |
| Pinoxaden + metsulfuron-methyl          | 45 + 4         | 1(0)    | 1(0)                                | 2.1   | 0                 | 100    | 100       | 98       | 100   | 0       | 0        |
| Pinoxaden + 2,4-D                       | 45 + 500       | 1(0))   | 1(0)                                | 2.9   | 3.1               | 100    | 100       | 90       | 93    | 0       | 0        |
| Carfentrazone-ethyl fb pinoxaden        | 20 and 45      | 1(0)    | 2(3)                                | 4.5   | 4.8               | 100    | 89        | 87       | 90    | 0       | 0        |
| Metsulfuron-methyl fb pinoxaden         | 4 and 45       | 1(0)    | 1(0)                                | 0     | 0                 | 91     | 100       | 92       | 100   | 0       | 0        |
| 2,4-D <i>fb</i> pinoxaden               | 500 and 45     | 1 (0)   | 1.4(1)                              | 2.8   | 3.5               | 100    | 93        | 94       | 90    | 0       | 0        |
| Pinoxaden <i>fb</i> Carfentrazone-ethyl | 45 and 20      | 1.7(2)  | 1(0)                                | 3.3   | 2.9               | 91     | 100       | 90       | 90    | 0       | 0        |
| Pinoxaden <i>fb</i> metsulfuron-methyl  | 45 and 4       | 1(0)    | 1(0)                                | 0     | 1.7               | 100    | 100       | 100      | 98    | 0       | 0        |
| Pinoxaden fb 2,4-D                      | 45 and 500     | 1(0)    | 1(0)                                | 3.3   | 2.6               | 100    | 100       | 91       | 94    | 0       | 0        |
| Carfentrazone-ethyl                     | 20             | 5.1(25) | 5.4(28)                             | 19.6  | 24.6              | 0      | 0         | 92       | 90    | 0       | 0        |
| Metsulfuron-methyl                      | 4              | 6.4(40) | 6.6(43)                             | 27.7  | 32.8              | 0      | 0         | 95       | 100   | 0       | 0        |
| 2,4-D                                   | 500            | 5.7(32) | 6.1(36)                             | 24.5  | 29.4              | 0      | 0         | 94       | 93    | 0       | 0        |
| Weedy                                   | -              | 5.9(34) | 6.5(41)                             | 47.8  | 52.6              | 0      | 0         | 0        | 0     | 0       | 0        |
| Weed-free                               | -              | 0(1)    | 0(1)                                | 0     | 0                 | 100    | 100       | 100      | 100   | 0       | 0        |
| LSD (P=0.05)                            |                | 0.42    | 0.61                                | 1.8   | 1.6               | 2.1    | 1.4       | 2.5      | 5.3   | -       | -        |

|  | Table 2. Effect | of herbicidal | treatments | on yield | attributes of | wheat |
|--|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------|---------------|-------|
|--|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------|---------------|-------|

| Treatment                              | Dose<br>(g/ha)   |         | of spikes<br>row length | Grains  | s/spike | U       | in weight<br>g) |         | yield<br>ha) |
|--|------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|-----------------|---------|--------------|
| Treatment                              | (g/11 <i>a</i> ) | 2006-07 | 2007-08                 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2006-07 | 2007-08         | 2006-07 | 2007-08      |
| Pinoxaden                              | 45               | 146     | 180.3                   | 49.7    | 51.0    | 43.1    | 42.7            | 4.26    | 4.55         |
| Pinoxaden + carfentrazone-ethyl        | 45 + 20          | 150.0   | 186.0                   | 50.0    | 50.0    | 43.2    | 43.3            | 4.65    | 4.82         |
| Pinoxaden + metsulfuron-methyl         | 45 + 4           | 151.3   | 188.2                   | 50.0    | 52.0    | 43.5    | 44.3            | 4.69    | 4.86         |
| Pinoxaden + 2,4-D                      | 45 + 500         | 149.7   | 186.6                   | 49.3    | 50.0    | 43.3    | 44.0            | 4.64    | 4.80         |
| Carfentrazone-ethyl fb pinoxaden       | 20 and 45        | 153.7   | 187.6                   | 49.7    | 502     | 43.2    | 43.5            | 4.51    | 4.64         |
| Metsulfuron-methyl fb pinoxaden        | 4 and 45         | 153.3   | 188.0                   | 50.3    | 51.0    | 43.2    | 43.6            | 4.59    | 4.78         |
| 2,4-D <i>fb</i> pinoxaden              | 500 and 45       | 149.0   | 185.7                   | 51.0    | 50.0    | 43.2    | 42.9            | 4.56    | 4.82         |
| Pinoxaden fb Carfentrazone-ethyl       | 45 and 20        | 152.0   | 185.0                   | 50.0    | 50.3    | 43.1    | 42.7            | 4.59    | 4.72         |
| Pinoxaden <i>fb</i> metsulfuron-methyl | 45 and 4         | 150.0   | 186.0                   | 50.7    | 50.7    | 43.1    | 43.3            | 4.66    | 4.86         |
| Pinoxaden <i>fb</i> 2,4-D              | 45 and 500       | 149.0   | 184.0                   | 49.0    | 49.0    | 43.4    | 43.9            | 4.60    | 4.79         |
| Carfentrazone-ethyl                    | 20               | 122.0   | 170.0                   | 47.0    | 50.0    | 43.0    | 43.7            | 3.70    | 3.82         |
| Metsulfuron-methyl                     | 4                | 123.7   | 169.7                   | 47.2    | 50.0    | 43.5    | 43.6            | 3.83    | 3.95         |
| 2,4-D                                  | 500              | 121.0   | 168.7                   | 48.0    | 48.7    | 42.4    | 42.9            | 3.65    | 3.84         |
| Weedy                                  | -                | 121.7   | 167.7                   | 48.3    | 47.7    | 43.0    | 43.0            | 2.93    | 3.26         |
| Weed free                              | -                | 150.1   | 188.0                   | 51.0    | 52.7    | 43.7    | 43.8            | 4.67    | 4.88         |
| LSD(P=0.05)                            |                  | 7.4     | 7.9                     | 2.4     | 2.1     | NS      | 0.9             | 0.48    | 0.24         |

tistically at par with all combinations of pinoxaden + metsulfuron and pinoxaden alone at both the application rates.

In 2006-07, maximum grain yield (4.69 t/ha) was recorded with use of pinoxaden + metsulfuron at 45+ 4 g/ ha which was at par with weed free (4.67 t/ha) and all combinations of pinoxaden and broad-leaved herbicides (Table 2). Similarly in 2007-08, maximum grain yield (4.88 t/ha) was recorded in weed free followed by pinoxaden + metsulfuron (4.86 t/ha), pinoxaden + carfentrazone (4.82 t/kg) and pinoxaden+ 2,4-D (4.80 t/ha). Presence of weeds throughout the growing season brought about 37.2 and 33.1 % reduction in grain yield as compared to weed-free check during 2006-07 and 2007-08, respectively.

## REFERENCES

- Banga RS and Yadav Ashok. 2004. Effect of fenoxaprop and sulfosulfuron alone and as tank mixture against complex weed flora in wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 36: 163-165.
- Chhokar RS and Malik RK. 2002. Isoproturon resistance in *Phalaris minor* and its response to alternate herbicides. *Weed Technology* **16**: 116-123.
- Chhokar RS, Sharma RK and Verma RPS. 2008. Pinoxaden for controlling grass weeds in wheat and barley. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **40**(1&2): 41-46.
- Malik RK and Malik YS. 1994. Development of herbicide resistance in India. pp. 64-81. In: *Appropriate Weed Control in Southern Asia*. (Eds. Sustroutome SS and Bruce Avid A) CAB International, London.
- Malik RK and Singh S.1995. Little seed canary grass (*Phalaris minor* Retz.) resistance to isoproturon in India. Weed Technology 9: 419-425.

- Punia SS and Yadav D. 2010. Bioefficacy of pinoxaden against little seed canary grass in wheat and residual effect on succeeding crops. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **41**(3&4): 148-153.
- Punia SS, Malik RK and Shoeran Parvinder. 2004. Bio-efficacy of tank mix combinations of fenoxaprop and clodinafop with broad-leaved herbicides for broad spectrum weed control in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Indian Journal of Ecology* **31**(2): 128-132.
- Punia SS, Yadav Dharambir Singh, Samunder and Dhawan Rupa 2008. Evaluation of different herbicides against clodinafop resistant population of *P.minor* in wheat, pp. 322-23. In: *Proceedings of National Symposium on New Paradigms in Agronomic Research*, Indian Society of Agronomy, 19-21, November, 2008 Navsari, Gujarat.
- Walia US, Gill BS and Sindhu VK. 2007. Pinoxaden A new alternate for controlling *Phalaris minor* in wheat, p.93. In: *Proceedings of Biennial Conference of Indian Society of Weed Science*, 1-2, November 2007, Hisar, Haryana.
- Yadav Dharam Bir, Punia SS, Yadav Ashok and Lal Roshan. 2009. Compatibility of sulfosulfuron with carfentrazone-ethyl for the control of complex weed flora in wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **41**(3&4): 146-149.
- Yadav Dharam Bir, Punia SS, Yadav Ashok and Lal Roshan. 2009. Compatibility of fenoxaprop-p-ethyl with carfentrazone-ethyl, metsulfuron or 2,4-D for controlling complex weed flora in wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **41**(3&4): 157-160.
- Walia US, Brar LS and Dhaliwal BK. 1998. Performance of clodinafop and fenoxaprop-p-ethyl for control of *P. minor* in wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **30**: 48-50.

**Solution** Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 93–98, 2013

# Resource conservation techniques and pendimethalin for control of weeds in *durum* wheat cultivars

## R.K. Jat<sup>1</sup>, R.S. Banga and Ashok Yadav\*

Department of Agronomy, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, Haryana 125 004

Received: 20 January 2013; Revised: 27 April 2013

#### ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted on *durum* wheat during 2005-06 and 2006-07 to study the effect of resource conservation techniques (RCTs), cultivars and pendimethalin herbicide on weeds and yield of *durum* wheat. Zero tillage (ZT) significantly reduced the population of *Phalaris minor* and dry matter of grassy weeds as compared to conventional tillage (CT) and furrow irrigated raised bed system (FIRBS), however, density and dry matter of broad-leaved weeds was higher under ZT that under CT and FIRBS. Grasses were predominant under FIRBS as compared to CT. Cultivar '*PDW 291*' had less density and dry weight of weeds having superior yield attributes and produced significantly higher grain yield over '*WH 896*' and '*WH 912*'. Pre-emergence application of pendimethalin (1.5 kg/ha) reduced the density and dry matter accumulation by grassy as well as broad-leaved weeds effectively and increased the wheat grain yield by 25% over weedy check.

Key words: Durum wheat, Pendimethalin, Resource conservation techniques, Weeds, Yield

Durum wheat (Triticum durum) is the second most important species, after Triticum aestivum, occupying nearly 10% of the wheat area in India. Earlier its cultivation primarily confined to the rainfed conditions of central and southern India, with very small area in Punjab and West Bengal mainly due to high susceptibility to rusts and foliar diseases. However, with the development of high yielding semi-dwarf type, a large area has come up in Punjab under irrigated conditions, where it was popularized to contain Karnal bunt disease. Now efforts are on to export it to earn foreign exchange (Anonymous 2009). The profitability, productivity and sustainability of rice-wheat cropping systems are at stake. Now, farmers need technologies which are more favorable for lowering their cost and improving their returns. They need environment friendly technologies those have less deleterious effect on natural resources. Under such situations, conservation agriculture based resource conservation techniques (RCTs) i.e. zero tillage (ZT) and furrow irrigated raised bed system (FIRBS) could be a valid option to reduce the turnaround time, water, cultivation cost and to ensure establishment of good crop stand of wheat without loss in productivity and sustainability of natural resources.

Since variation in planting system modifies macroand micro-environment to which plants are exposed, there is a need to identify most appropriate variety best suited for each of the planting system. It has been reported that both *T. aestivum* and *T. durum* wheat varieties differ in physio-morphological traits, thus there is need to identify most appropriate one from the existing recommended varieties of durum wheat species under prevailing conditions in context to changes in planting pattern. Much of the research work was focused on such issues in recent past but mainly in bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). Since *durum* wheat may also find ample scope in near future in India due to changing food habits, it was realized to conduct the present investigation to study the effect resource conservation techniques, cultivars and pendimethalin on weeds and performance of durum wheat.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted on *durum* wheat during *Rabi* of 2005-06 and 2006-07 in a field having soil sandy loam in texture, slightly alkaline in reaction (8.2), low in available N (209.6 kg/ha), medium in available P (15.7 kg/ha) and high in available K (408.0 kg/ha) at Research Farm, Department of Agronomy, CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar, India. The experiment including three resource conservation techniques, *viz.* ZT, CT and FIRBS in main plot and three cultivars (*WH 896*, *WH 912* and *PDW 291*) and two weed control treatments (pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha and weedy check) in sub-plots was laid out in split-plot design in four replications. ZT plots were kept undisturbed after harvesting of mungbean

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: aky444@gmail.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>CIMMYT-India, IARI Regional Station, Pusa, Samastipur, Bihar

crop. CT plots were prepared by harrowing thrice followed by cultivator and planking. The plots marked for FIRBS were harrowed thrice followed by cultivator twice and a planking to prepare a finer seed bed. Beds were made using a bed planter, having bed dimension of 37.5 on top with 30 cm wide furrows (between two beds). Under ZT plots, glyphosate (1.5 kg/ha) was sprayed 7 days before sowing to control the pre-emerged perennial weeds. The experimental crop was raised using recommended dose of N (150 kg/ha) and P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (60 kg/ha) through DAP and urea. As per treatments, sowing under ZT, CT and FIRBS was done using ZT drill, CT drill and bed planter each at a seed rate of 100 kg/ha on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2005 and 14<sup>th</sup> November 2006 during first and second year of experimentation, respectively.

Pendimethalin (1.5 kg/ha) was applied as pre-emergence using knapsack sprayer fitted with flat fan nozzle using a spray volume of 500 l/ha. Weeds from two randomly selected places of 1 m<sup>2</sup> were counted species wise, removed and dried at 70°C for recording the dry matter at 30 and 60 days after sowing (DAS). All other agronomic practices were adopted as per recommended package of practices. The crop was harvested on 7th April 2006 during the first year and 13th April 2007, during the second year. Harvesting was done manually by cutting the plants from the ground level with the help of sickles. The crop was left in the field for one week for sun drying. The crop was threshed plot wise with the help of mini-thresher and the grain yield was recorded. Data was analyzed by the method of analysis of variance (ANOVA) as described by Panse and Sukhatme(1985).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Effect on weeds

During both the years, ZT, CT and FIRBS were dominated by similar weed species, *viz. Phalaris minor, Avena ludoviciana, Chenopodium album, Anagallis arvensis* and *Melilotus indica*. Weeds like *Coronopus didymus, Convolvulus arvensis* and *Rumex dentatus* were present in lesser number and were therefore grouped as miscellaneous weeds (Table 1).

Among the complex weed flora at 30 DAS, the grassy weeds accounted for 30.2, 41.1 and 39.4% during 2005-06 and 32.1, 40.6 and 42.2% during 2006-07 under ZT, CT and FIRBS, respectively. The corresponding values for broad-leaved weeds were 69.8, 58.9 and 60.6%, during 2005-06 and 67.9, 59.4 and 57.8% during 2006-07. ZT significantly lowered the population of P. minor (14.1 plants/m<sup>2</sup>) as compared to FIRBS (27.3 plants/m<sup>2</sup>) and CT (24.0 plants /m<sup>2</sup>) at 60 DAS (Table 2). This could be due to undisturbed inter-row space in ZT, where seeds of P. minor lying at lower depths did not germinate. Malik et al. (2000a) have already reported less germination of P. minor under ZT. In FIRBS and CT, repeated ploughing brought the weed seeds on upper soil surface and create favorable conditions for weed seed emergence. Tillage practices did not influence the population of A. ludoviciana, while the population of C. album, A. arvensis and miscellaneous broad-leaved weeds were significantly lower under CT than recorded under ZT. Singh et al. (2002b) and Yadav et al. (2002) also reported similar results. ZT significantly reduced the dry matter accumulation by grassy weeds to the tune of 27.9 and 32.3% over CT and FIRBS,

| XX7                |      | 2005-06 | 5     |      | 2006-07 | 7     |
|--------------------|------|---------|-------|------|---------|-------|
| Weed species       | ZT   | СТ      | FIRBS | ZT   | СТ      | FIRBS |
| Grassy             |      |         |       |      |         |       |
| Phalaris minor     | 16.5 | 27.2    | 26.5  | 17.1 | 27.2    | 29.0  |
| Avena ludoviciana  | 13.7 | 13.9    | 12.9  | 14.9 | 13.4    | 13.2  |
| Total              | 30.2 | 41.1    | 39.4  | 32.1 | 40.6    | 42.2  |
| Broad-leaved       |      |         |       |      |         |       |
| Chenopodium album  | 19.5 | 16.3    | 17.9  | 21.3 | 16.0    | 16.5  |
| Melilotus indica   | 16.2 | 15.5    | 14.1  | 16.5 | 15.9    | 14.0  |
| Anagallis arvensis | 17.3 | 14.4    | 13.4  | 13.4 | 13.2    | 13.2  |
| Rumex dentatus     | 16.7 | 12.7    | 15.3  | 16.8 | 14.3    | 14.1  |
| Total              | 69.8 | 58.9    | 60.6  | 67.9 | 59.4    | 57.8  |

Table 1. Per cent composition of weed flora in weedy check at 30 DAS

ZT-Zero tillage, CT- Conventional tillage, FIRBS- Furrow irrigated raised bed system

respectively (Table 3). Better tilth and exposure of weed seeds to upper soil in CT and FIRBS might have increased the population and thereby dry weight of weeds in these systems. Malik *et al.* (2000b) also reported similar results. The dry matter accumulation by broad-leaved weeds was significantly higher under ZT in comparison to CT. This might be due to more congenial environment in ZT for broad-leaved weeds. These results are in conformity with the earlier findings (Singh *et al.* 2002a, Yaduraju and Mishra 2002).

On an average, cultivar '*PDW 291*' significantly reduced the population of *P. minor* (20.0 /m<sup>2</sup>) as compared to cultivar '*WH 896*' (23.5/m<sup>2</sup>). Population of *A. ludoviciana, C. album, M. indica* and miscellaneous broad-leaved weeds as well as dry matter accumulation of both grassy and broad-leaved weeds was not much influenced by different cultivars. Similar results were reported earlier by Bhat (2005).

Pre-emergence application of pendimethalin significantly lowered the density of all the weed species in comparison to weedy check plots during both the years (Table 2). Pendimethalin on an average reduced the dry matter accumulation by grassy and broad-leaved weeds to the extent of 71.6 and 59.2%, respectively at 60 DAS (Table 3). Similarly, 62% control of both grassy and broad-leaved weeds by pendimethalin was observed by Singh and Khole (1998), and Shukla and Mishra (2006).

#### Effect on crop

In general, yield attributes, grain, straw and biological yields were comparatively higher in second year. This might be due to combined effect of rainfall and comparatively low temperature in the month of February and March, which favored spike and grain development during the month of March, leading to increase in growing period of the crop.

The yield components of wheat crop, *viz*. number of spikes/mrl, spike length, grains per spike and 1000-grain weight were not influenced significantly by various resource conservation techniques (Table 3).

2

| Table 2. Effect of resource conservation techniques, | , cultivars and weed control treatments on density (no./m) of |
|--|---|
| different weeds                                      |   |

|               | <i>P. m</i> | inor        | A<br>ludovi |             | C. al       | bum         | A. ar       | vensis      | <i>M</i> . <i>i</i> | ndica       | Oth         | ior         |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Treatment     | 2005-<br>06 | 2006-<br>07 | 2005-<br>06 | 2006-<br>07 | 2005-<br>06 | 2006-<br>07 | 2005-<br>06 | 2006-<br>07 | 2005-<br>06         | 2006-<br>07 | 2005-<br>06 | 2006-<br>07 |
| RCTs          |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |                     |             |             |             |
| ZT            | 3.6         | 3.6         | 3.8         | 3.7         | 3.9         | 3.8         | 3.9         | 3.7         | 3.6                 | 3.6         | 3.9         | 3.6         |
|               | (14.5)      | (13.7)      | (14.1)      | (13.9)      | (16.6)      | (15.8)      | (16.3)      | (13.8)      | (13.7)              | (13.5)      | (15.5)      | (13.3)      |
| СТ            | 4.7         | 4.8         | 3.7         | 3.8         | 3.7         | 3.6         | 3.8         | 3.5         | 3.6                 | 3.6         | 3.5         | 3.5         |
|               | (23.6)      | (24.5)      | (13.9)      | (14.0)      | (14.1)      | (13.1)      | (15.2)      | (12.8)      | (12.8)              | (12.8)      | (12.3)      | (12.1)      |
| FIRBS         | 5.1         | 5.1         | 3.7         | 3.6         | 3.9         | 3.7         | 3.8         | 3.8         | 3.6                 | 3.6         | 3.8         | 3.6         |
|               | (27.4)      | (27.2)      | (13.6)      | (12.9)      | (15.9)      | (14.2)      | (14.6)      | (12.7)      | (13.0)              | (12.8)      | (14.6)      | (13.3)      |
| LSD (P=0.05)  | 0.2         | 0.2         | NS          | NS          | 0.1         | 0.1         | 0.1         | 0.1         | NS                  | NS          | 0.1         | 0.1         |
| Cultivars     |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |                     |             |             |             |
| 'WH 896'      | 4.6         | 4.7         | 3.9         | 3.7         | 3.8         | 3.8         | 3.9         | 3.8         | 3.6                 | 3.6         | 3.8         | 3.6         |
|               | (23.3)      | (23.7)      | (14.6)      | (13.8)      | (15.7)      | (14.8)      | (16.1)      | (14.9)      | (13.2)              | (13.2)      | (14.8)      | (13.3)      |
| 'WH 912'      | 4.5         | 4.5         | 3.7         | 3.7         | 3.8         | 3.7         | 3.9         | 3.6         | 3.6                 | 3.6         | 3.8         | 3.6         |
|               | (22.1)      | (21.6)      | (13.1)      | (13.6)      | (15.1)      | (14.5)      | (15.6)      | (12.7)      | (13.2)              | (13.3)      | (14.0)      | (13.1)      |
| 'PDW 291''    | 4.3         | 4.4         | 3.7         | 3.7         | 3.9         | 3.6         | 3.7         | 3.4         | 3.6                 | 3.5         | 3.6         | 3.5         |
|               | (20.0)      | (20.0)      | (13.8)      | (13.3)      | (15.8)      | (13.9)      | (14.4)      | (11.6)      | (13.2)              | (12.6)      | (13.6)      | (12.3)      |
| LSD (P=0.05)  | 0.2         | 0.2         | NS          | NS          | NS          | NS          | 0.2         | 0.2         | NS                  | NS          | NS          | NS          |
| Herbicide     |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |             |                     |             |             |             |
| Pendimethalin | 3.0         | 3.2         | 3.1         | 2.9         | 2.7         | 2.5         | 2.7         | 2.6         | 2.5                 | 2.5         | 2.8         | 2.7         |
| (1.5 kg/ha)   | (8.6)       | (9.3)       | (8.6)       | (7.9)       | (6.6)       | (5.3)       | (6.7)       | (5.6)       | (5.6)               | (5.4)       | (7.1)       | (6.4)       |
| Weedy check   | 5.9         | 5.8         | 4.5         | 4.5         | 5.0         | 4.9         | 4.9         | 4.6         | 4.6                 | 4.6         | 4.7         | 4.5         |
| ,             | (35.0)      | (34.3)      | (19.1)      | (19.3)      | (24.4)      | (23.5)      | (24.0)      | (20.5)      | (20.8)              | (20.7)      | (21.2)      | (19.4)      |
| LSD (P=0.05)  | 0.2         | 0.2         | 0.1         | 0.1         | 0.2         | 0.1         | 0.1         | 0.1         | 0.1                 | 0.1         | 0.1         | 0.14        |

Original data given in parentheses were subjected to square root  $(\sqrt{x+1})$  transformation before analysis; ZT - Zero tillage; CT - Conventional tillage; FIRBS- Furrow-irrigated raised-bed system

The two years average grain yield of *durum* wheat under ZT, CT and FIRBS was 5.46, 5.33 and 5.31 t/ha, respectively. Similar or higher yield attributes in ZT than CT were reported earlier by many researchers (Malik *et al.* 2000b, Yadav *et al.* 2005, Kakkar *et al.* 2005).

Among three cultivars, 'PDW 291' produced highest number of spikes, longer spike, more grain per spike and improved 1000-grain weight. Cultivar 'PDW 291' on an average produced 6.5 and 9.7% higher number of spikes than that produced by 'WH 896' and 'WH 912', respectively. Average spike length of cultivars, 'PDW 291', 'WH 912' and 'WH 896' was 9.8, 9.2 and 9.5 cm, respectively. Cultivar, 'PDW 291' produced 7.1 and 11.6 % more grains per spike than that produced by cultivars 'WH 912' and 'WH 896', respectively. During each year of study, cultivar, 'PDW 291' recorded significantly highest 1000-grain weight and it was lowest in 'WH 912'. Cultivar 'PDW 291' produced significantly higher grain yield by 6.0 and 10.2% over the cultivars 'WH 896' and 'WH 912', respectively. Mahajan et al. (2004), Kumar et al. (2005) and Bhat (2005) also reported similar results. The marked increase in number of spikes of 'PDW 291' might be due to improved growth of plants at successive stages as reflected by higher dry matter accumulation. This subscribes to view that there was adequate supply of metabolites in cultivar 'PDW 291' compared to other cultivars for growth and development of effective tillers. Besides number of spikes, higher grains per spike, spike length and 1000-grain weight

under '*PDW 29*' also seems to be on account of higher dry matter accumulation and its inherent characters. It is well documented that in wheat crop, the potential number of various yield components are decided during vegetative phase while reproductive stage determines their realizable number and size. Meisner *et al.* (1992) also opined that efficient partitioning of dry matter to harvestable part (grains) from rest of the plant parts is most important for realization of higher wheat yield.

Application of pendimethalin as pre-emergence significantly increased the yield attributing parameters *i.e.* the number of spikes, spike length and grains per spike over weedy check (Table 3). The average increment in number of spikes, spike length and grains per spike was 26.5, 7.2 and 16.7%, respectively over weedy plots. The average 1000-grain weight under pendimethalin treated plots (41.6 g) and weedy check (40.6 g) was similar. The increase in grain and straw yields due to pendimethalin application was 25.0 and 19.7% over weedy check, respectively. Higher yield attributes and yield with pendimethalin over weedy check have also been reported by Singh and Singh (1996) and Shukla and Mishra (2006). Pendimethalin reduced the density and dry matter accumulation by grassy as well as broadleaf weeds very effectively and on an average, it increased the grain yield of wheat by 25% over weedy check.

The concomitant effect of resource conservation techniques, cultivars and weed control significantly influenced

|                               |         | Dry ma  | tter (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) |           | Spike   | length  | Gra     | ins/    | 1000-   | -grain  | Grair   | n yield |
|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Treatment                     | Grassy  | weeds   | Broad-lea                | wed weeds | (c      | m)      | spi     | ke      | weig    | ht (g)  | (t/     | ha)     |
|                               | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2005-06                  | 2006-07   | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2005-06 | 2006-07 |
| RCTs                          |         |         |                          |           |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| ZT                            | 13.3    | 12.8    | 14.2                     | 12.8      | 9.4     | 9.7     | 47.3    | 49.5    | 41.2    | 42.2    | 5.28    | 5.64    |
| СТ                            | 17.8    | 18.4    | 12.5                     | 11.7      | 9.3     | 9.5     | 45.7    | 48.3    | 39.9    | 40.5    | 5.12    | 5.54    |
| FIRBS                         | 19.5    | 19.1    | 13.6                     | 12.5      | 9.5     | 9.8     | 46.2    | 47.8    | 40.9    | 41.9    | 5.14    | 5.49    |
| LSD (P=0.05)                  | 1.1     | 1.2     | 1.0                      | 0.7       | NS      |
| Cultivars                     |         |         |                          |           |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| 'WH 896'                      | 18      | 17.8    | 13.7                     | 12.7      | 9.4     | 9.7     | 46      | 48      | 40.3    | 41.3    | 5.13    | 5.53    |
| 'WH 912'                      | 16.7    | 16.7    | 13.7                     | 12.5      | 9.1     | 9.4     | 44.1    | 46.1    | 39.2    | 40.1    | 4.96    | 5.31    |
| 'PDW 291'                     | 16      | 15.8    | 13                       | 11.8      | 9.7     | 9.9     | 49.2    | 51.5    | 42.4    | 43.3    | 5.46    | 5.84    |
| LSD (P=0.05)                  | 2.4     | 2.3     | NS                       | NS        | 0.5     | 0.5     | 2.4     | 2.5     | 2.1     | 2.1     | 0.27    | 0.29    |
| Herbicide                     |         |         |                          |           |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Pendimethalin<br>(1.5 kg /ha) | 7       | 8.1     | 6.8                      | 8.1       | 9.7     | 10      | 50.3    | 51.8    | 41.1    | 42      | 5.76    | 6.17    |
| Weedy check                   | 26.8    | 26.5    | 20                       | 16.6      | 9.1     | 9.3     | 42.5    | 45.2    | 40.1    | 41      | 4.60    | 4.94    |
| LSD (P=0.05)                  | 0.2     | 0.4     | 0.3                      | 0.2       | 0.1     | 0.2     | 0.4     | 0.4     | NS      | NS      | 0.04    | 0.04    |

 Table 3. Effect of resource conservation techniques, cultivars and weed control treatments on weed dry matter (60 DAS), yield attributes and yield of *durum* wheat

R.K. Jat, R.S. Banga and Ashok Yadav



T1 - Pendimethalin (1.5 kg/ha); T2 - Weedy check; ZT - Zero tillage; CT - Conventional tillage; FIRBS- Furrowirrigated raised-bed system

## Fig. 1. Interactive effect of resource conservation techniques, cultivars and weed control treatments on grain yield of *durum* wheat.

the grain yield of durum wheat during both the years (Fig.1). During 2005-06 cultivar, 'WH 896' under ZT and FIRBS, when treated with pendimethalin gave statistically same yield of 5.92 and 5.74 t/ha, however, the grain yield significantly decreased when cultivar 'WH 896' (5.51 t/ha) sown under CT and treated with pendimethalin. Similarly, cultivar, 'WH 912' under CT and cultivar 'PDW 291' under ZT gave significantly higher grain yield of 5.73 and 6.33 t/ha compared to the situation when these cultivars were sown under ZT and CT, respectively at same weed control treatment (pendimethalin). Highest grain yield of 6.33 t/ha was produced by cultivar 'PDW 291' under ZT when treated with pendimethalin. This treatment combination produced 46.2% higher grain yield than that produced under cultivar 'WH 912' under CT without weed control (4.33 t/ha). Similar interaction effects among resource conservation techniques, cultivars and weed control were observed in 2006-07.

#### REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 2009. http://dacnet.nic.in/dwd/wheat\_prod/ quality\_export.htm
- Bhat MA. 2005. Studies on competitiveness of bed planted wheat and Phalaris minor under different agronomic practices. Ph. D. Thesis, PAU, Ludhiana

- Kakkar V, Sharma SD, Punia SS and Malik RK. 2005. Efficacy of herbicides for the control of *Phalaris minor* in wheat under different tillage practices at farmer's field, pp. 39-53. In: *Proceedings of Workshop on Acceleration of Resource Conservation Technology*, June 1-2, 2005 at CCSHAU, Hisar, India.
- Kumar S, Singh D, Yadav A and Malik RK. 2005. Performance of wheat varieties under raised bed planting with different methods of nitrogen placement, pp. 74-78. In: *Proceedings of Workshop on Acceleration of Resource Conservation Technology*, June 1-2, 2005 at CCSHAU, Hisar, India.
- Mahajan G, Brar LS and Sardana V. 2004. Efficacy of clodinafop against isoproturon resistant *Phalaris minor* in relation to wheat cultivars and spacing. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 36: 166-170.
- Malik RK, Singh S, Yadav A and Singh H. 2000a. Zero-tillage sowing of wheat - A boon for the farmers. *Haryana Farming* (Dec.): 1-2.
- Malik RK, Yadav A, Banga RS and Singh S. 2000b. Zero-till wheat sowing and alternate herbicides against resistant *Phalaris minor* in rice-wheat cropping system. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **32**: 220-222.
- Meisner CA, Acevedo E, Flores D, Sayra K, Ortiz-Monasteris D, Byerlee D and Limen A. 1992. Wheat production and growers practices in the Yaqui Valley. Wheat Special Report 6, CIMMYT, Mexico City.
- Panse VG and Sukhatme PV. 1985. Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers, 3rd Edn. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi, India.

- Shukla DK and Mishra OP. 2006. Efficacy of different herbicides in bed planted late sown wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **38**(1): 12-15.
- Singh G and Singh OP. 1996. Response of late-sown wheat to seeding methods and weed control measures in flood-prone areas. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **41**: 237-242.
- Singh L, Pandey DS, Misra, RD. Prakash A and Singh VP. 2002a. Tillage-cum-herbicide use studies in wheat grown under rice (*Oryza sativa*) - wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) cropping system, pp. 957-958. In: *Extended summaries of 2<sup>nd</sup> International Con*gress, New Delhi, Nov. 26-30, 2002.
- Singh RK and Khole SS.1998. *Phalaris minor* Retz. management in wheat. *World Weeds* **5**: 135-141.
- Singh S, Yadav A, Malik RK and Singh H. 2002b. Long-term effect of zero-tillage sowing technique on weed flora and productivity of wheat in rice-wheat cropping zone of Indo-Gangetic plains, pp. 155-157. In: Proceedings of International Workshop on Herbicide Resistance Management and Zero Tillage in Rice-Wheat Cropping System. CCS HAU, Hisar, India. March, 4-6, 2002.

- Yadav A, Malik RK, Jaipal S, Singh S, Singh R, Ram K and Singh S. 2005. Sustainability of long-term zero-tillage in wheat and its impact on the productivity of rice, pp. 18-23. In: *Proceedings of Workshop on Acceleration of Resource Conservation Technology*, June 1-2, 2005 at CCSHAU, Hisar, India.
- Yadav A, Malik RK, Banga RS, Singh S, Chauhan BS, Yadav DB, Murti R and Malik RS. 2002. Long-term effects of zero-tillage on wheat in rice-wheat cropping system, pp. 158-161. In: Proceedings of International Workshop on Herbicide Resistance Management and Zero Tillage in Rice-Wheat Cropping System. CCS HAU, Hisar, India. March, 4-6, 2002.
- Yaduraju NT and Mishra JS. 2002. Zero tillage in rice-wheat cropping system on vertisols in Madhya Pradesh - prospects and problems, pp.117-119. In: Proceedings of International Workshop on Herbicide Resistance Management and Zero Tillage in Rice-Wheat Cropping System. CCS HAU, Hisar, India. March, 4-6, 2002.

Indian Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 99–105, 2013

## Nutrient removal by weeds and crops as affected by herbicide combinations in soybean-wheat cropping system

Navell Chander, Suresh Kumar\*, Ramesh and Surinder Singh Rana

Department of Agronomy, Forages and Grassland Management, CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh 176 062

Received: 25 February 2013; Revised: 11 May 2013

## ABSTRACT

Eight weed control treatments in soybean and three in wheat were evaluated in soybean-wheat cropping system during 2009-10 and 2010-11 at Palampur. Commelina benghalensis followed by Echinochloa colona were the most competitive weeds in soybean. In wheat, Phalaris minor and Avena ludoviciana were the most predominant weeds. Pendimethalin *fb* chlorimuron reduced dry weight of *Aeschynomene*, Ageratum, Cyperus, Echinochloa and Panicum significantly over the unweeded check. Isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2, 4-D 500 g/ha reduced dry weight of *Phalaris minor* over the weedy check. In soybean, application of pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl allowed weeds to remove 89.2, 89.1 and 88.9% less N, P and K, respectively as compared to the unweeded check. Application of isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha reduced N, P and K depletion by weeds by more than 24% over the unweeded check. Application of pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl resulted in 187.5% higher N and 166.3% higher K uptake by soybean over weedy check. Unchecked weed growth reduced P uptake by 62.4% as compared to pendimethalin fb chlorimuron ethyl. Isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha and isoproturon 750 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha resulted in significantly higher N, P and K uptake by wheat over unweeded check. Weedy check reduced soybean equivalent yield by 37.4 and 28.8% during 2009 and 2010, respectively. Imazethapyr fb imazethapyr produced higher soybean equivalent yield (3.34 t/ha) during 2009, whereas, pendimethalin fb chlorimuron (3.16 t/ha) was better during 2010. Isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha (₹ 1,17,736) and isoproturon 750 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha (₹ 1,16,861) resulted in higher net returns and net per ₹ invested as compared to weedy check.

Key words: Chlorimuron, Herbicide, Imazethapyr, Nutrient removal, Pendimethalin, Quizalofop, Soybean

Soybean-wheat cropping system has a great potential in northern plains of India. With many problems in the traditional rice-wheat (Verma and Sharma 2007) or maize-wheat cropping systems, the soybean-wheat has emerged as a good alternative both for crop diversification as well as for maintaining the sustainable soil health. In fact, soil nutrient supply is improved when crops with relatively high nutrient demands are rotated with crops leaving relatively high amount of residues containing substantial amount of nutrients. Soybean is one crop, which builds up the soil fertility by atmospheric nitrogen fixation through the root nodules and also through leaves falling on the ground at maturity. Besides residual effect on soil fertility, soybean has great potential as an exceptionally nutritive and very rich protein food. Being long duration crop, wheat also exhausts the soil to maximum potential. Infestation of weeds removes nutrients from the soil thus, adversely affects the production of both the crops.

Weeds increase cost of cultivation and deplete the resource base (Buriro *et al.* 2003 and Upadhyay *et al.* 2012). In order to achieve enhanced crop production and higher benefits from applied inputs, weeds must be kept under check by any of the safe and effective mean. Herbicide combinations are more effective weapons in tackling weed menace and thereby nutrient depletion by them than a single herbicide approach (Pisal and Sagarka 2013 and Upadhyay *et al.* 2013). Therefore, present study works out nutrient removal by weeds and crops and impact on system productivity as influenced by herbicide combinations in soybean-wheat cropping system.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during *Kharif* 2009-10 and 2010-11 at Palampur (32° 62 N Latitude, 76° 32 E longitude, 1280 m above msl). The soil of experimental site was silty clay loam in texture, acidic in reaction (5.6), low in available nitrogen (204.6 kg/ha), medium in available phosphorus (18.1 kg/ha) and high in

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: skg\_63@yahoo.com

available potassium (308.2 kg/ha). Eight weed control treatments, viz. pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (pre), imazethepyr 200 g/ha (pre), quizalofop-ethyl 60 g/ha (early post), imazethapyr 75 g/ha (pre) fb imazethapyr 75 g/ha (early post), quizalofop-ethyl 50 g/ha + chlorimuron-ethyl 4 g/ ha (early post), pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb chlorimuron-ethyl 4 g/ha (early post), hand weeding (twice) and weedy check in soybean as main plot factors and weedy check, isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha + 2,4-D 0.50 kg/ha and isoproturon 0.75 kg/ha + 2,4-D 0.50 kg/ha (post emergence) in wheat as sub-plot factors were tested in split plot design with three replications. The seeds of soybean variety 'Harit Soya' were sown in rows 45 cm apart on June 18, 2009 and June 5, 2010 using 75 kg seed/ha. The crop was fertilized with 20 kg N, 60 kg P2O5 and 40 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha as basal dose. Wheat variety 'HPW-155' was sown on November 11, 2009 and November 3, 2010 using 100 kg seed/ha. The crop was fertilized with 120 kg N, 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and 30 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha. In each crop, required amount of N, P and K was supplied through urea, single super phosphate and muriate of potash, respectively. Herbicides were applied with the help of Maruyama power sprayer using flat fan nozzle. Rest of the management practices were in accordance with the recommended package of practices for individual crop. Weed dry weight was recorded by placing 50 x 50 cm quadrates at two random places in each plot and after drying them in hot air oven (72°C for 72 hours). Yields were harvested from net plot.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Effect on weeds

Soybean: The experimental field was infested with Commelina benghalensis (43.36 and 57.87% during 2009 and 2010, respectively), Echinochloa colona (18.04 and 15.02%), Aeschynomene indica (3.78 and 2.73%), Ageratum conyzoides (3.68 and 4.91%), Panicum dichotomiflorum (11.53 and 5.12%), Digitaria sanguinalis (4.25 and 3.69%), Eleusine indica (3.54 and 3.48%) and Cyperus sp. (9.21 and 5.12%). Commelina benghalensis was the most dominant weed in soybean (Singh et al. 1992, Rajput and Kushwah 2004 and Kumar et al. 2008).

Weeds accumulated maximum dry matter by 60 DAS. On dry weight basis *Commelina* was most competitive weed in soybean and assumed alarming growth particularly in 2009. All the three combinations of herbicides were comparable to hand weeding twice in influencing its growth. Imazethapyr and quizalofop-ethyl also could bring down its dry weight during 2009 and were as good as the above treatments in reducing its dry weight. However, pendimethalin was not effective against *Commelina* during both the years. Application of imazethapyr, pendimethalin, pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl and hand weeding (twice) significantly reduced the dry weight of Aeschynomene over the unweeded check during 2009. Pendimethalin *fb* chlorimuron-ethyl remaining at par with pendimethalin alone and hand weeding (twice) resulted in significantly lower dry weight of Ageratum during 2010. All treatments were significantly superior to unweeded check in controlling Cyperus during both the years and Digitaria during 2010. Application of quizalofop-ethyl, imazethapyr fb imazethapyr, quizalofop-ethyl + chlorimuron-ethyl and pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl remaining at par with each other resulted in significant lower dry weight of *Echinochloa* during both the years. Dry weight of Panicum dichotomiflorum was significantly affected during 2009. All treatments except imazethapyr fb imazethapyr significantly reduced dry weight of Panicum dichotomiflorum over weedy check. However, weed control treatments could not significantly reduced the dry weight of Polygonum alatum and Eleusine indica. All treatments except pendimethalin during 2009 significantly decreased total weed dry weight over the untreated check. Pendimethalin *fb* chlorimuron resulted in significantly lower total weed dry weight. However other herbicidal mixtures during both the years and imazethapyr, quizalofop-ethyl and hand weeding during 2009 were compareable to pendimethalin fb chlorimuron. Herbicide combinations had an edge over the individual application of herbicides in reducing total weed dry weight. Superiority of herbicide combinations has been documented (Singh et al., 2006a Upadhyay et al., 2013 and Jadhav and Gadade 2012). The residual effects of treatments in wheat were not significant on weeds in soybean.

**Wheat:** Phalaris minor and Avena ludoviciana were the most predominant weeds constituting 66.5 and 27.65% of the total weed flora. The other weeds found growing in association with wheat crop were *Lolium temulentum* (2.0%), Vicia sativa (3.0%) and Coronopus didymus (0.6%).

The application of herbicides in soybean did not cause any residual activity in influencing the dry weight of weeds in wheat as dry weight of different weeds in wheat was not significantly affected under weed control treatments in soybean. Application of isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha behaved statistically alike to isoproturon 750 g/ ha+ 2,4-D 500 g/ ha resulted in significantly lower dry weight of *Phalaris minor* and *Avena ludoviciana* at 90 DAS as compared to weedy check. Weed control treatments in wheat did not significantly influence the dry weight of *Lolium temulentum*. Application of isoproturon

| Treatment   | Rate          | Time                | Com                   | nelina                        |                     | ynom-<br>ne         | Ager               | ratum               | Сур               | erus                |                    | noch-<br>Da        | Pan                | icum               | Digi                | taria               | Тс                     | otal                   |
|---|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Treatment   | (g/ha)        | Time                | 2009                  | 2010                          | 2009                | 2010                | 2009               | 2010                | 2009              | 2010                | 2009               | 2010               | 2009               | 2010               | 2009                | 2010                | 2009                   | 2010                   |
| Soybean   |               |                     |                       |                               |                     |                     |                    |                     |                   |                     |                    |                    |                    |                    |                     |                     |                        |                        |
| T <sub>1</sub> - Pendimethalin                                | 1500          | Pre                 | 18.6                  | 12.1                          | 2.9                 | 2.0                 | 3.3                | 7.4                 | 2.2               | 2.5                 | 7.1                | 5.2                | 1.7                | 2.5                | 1.0                 | 2.5                 | 21.5                   | 15.3                   |
| T <sub>2</sub> - Imazethapyr                                  | 200           | Pre                 | (403)<br>3.7          | (148)<br>12.3                 | (10)<br>1.2         | (7)<br>3.0          | (16)<br>3.3        | (61)<br>4.9         | (7)<br>2.2        | (10)<br>4.4         | (68)<br>7.0        | (30)<br>7.2        | (3)<br>2.8         | (9)<br>3.3         | (0)<br>3.9          | (10)<br>3.1         | (497)<br>10.0          | (238)<br>17.1          |
| T <sub>3</sub> - Quizalofop-ethyl                             | 60            | EP                  | (15)<br>10.4<br>(145) | (167)<br>11.5<br>(157)        | (0)<br>4.0<br>(20)  | (12)<br>2.8<br>(10) | (20)<br>2.5<br>(8) | (32)<br>4.4<br>(26) | (5)<br>1.9<br>(3) | (22)<br>3.5<br>(17) | (65)<br>1.3<br>(2) | (60)<br>2.4<br>(7) | (9)<br>1.2<br>(1)  | (17)<br>2.2<br>(7) | (41)<br>2.8<br>(18) | (15)<br>4.2<br>(24) | (107)<br>12.0<br>(179) | (307)<br>13.9<br>(216) |
| T <sub>4</sub> - Imazethapyr <i>fb</i><br>imazethapyr         | 75 fb<br>75   | Pre <i>fb</i><br>EP | (143)<br>4.3<br>(32)  | (1 <i>3</i> 7)<br>6.9<br>(48) | (20)<br>3.6<br>(18) | (10)<br>2.0<br>(5)  | (0)<br>1.8<br>(3)  | (20)<br>4.8<br>(33) | (3)<br>1.3<br>(1) | (17)<br>1.1<br>(0)  | (2)<br>1.0<br>(0)  | (11)               | (1)<br>4.8<br>(31) | (7)<br>3.8<br>(24) | (10)<br>4.3<br>(28) | (24)<br>2.7<br>(9)  | 9.0<br>(96)            | (210)<br>10.3<br>(110) |
| T <sub>5</sub> - Quizalofop-ethyl +<br>chlorimuron-ethyl      | 50 +<br>4     | EP                  | 10.3 (127)            | 6.6<br>(45)                   | (10)<br>4.7<br>(29) | 2.8<br>(11)         | (0)<br>1.1<br>(0)  | 3.1<br>(13)         | (1)<br>1.1<br>(0) | (8)<br>(8)          | (3)<br>1.5<br>(2)  | 2.6<br>(11)        | 1.0 (0)            | (2.4<br>(8)        | (20)<br>1.5<br>(3)  | 2.0<br>(5)          | 11.7<br>(160)          | (110)<br>9.5<br>(94)   |
| T <sub>6</sub> - Pendimethalin <i>fb</i><br>chlorimuron-ethyl | 1500<br>fb 4  | Pre <i>fb</i><br>EP | 4.9<br>(30)           | 6.7<br>(45)                   | $(1)^{(1)}$         | 2.6<br>(10)         | 1.3 (1)            | 2.5<br>(10)         | 1.2 (0)           | 1.0 (0)             | 3.2 (12)           | 3.2 (12)           | 1.8<br>(3)         | (a)<br>1.9<br>(4)  | (1.9<br>(4)         | 1.7<br>(3)          | 6.7<br>(49)            | 8.9<br>(82)            |
| T <sub>7</sub> - Hand weeding                                 | twice         | 25&40<br>DAS        | 3.6<br>(18)           | 8.6<br>(75)                   | 1.3 (1)             | 2.6<br>(12)         | 2.3<br>(6)         | 7.9<br>(69)         | 2.1<br>(4)        | 3.8<br>(19)         | 8.4<br>(76)        | 7.1<br>(59)        | 2.1<br>(4)         | 3.5<br>(15)        | 1.7<br>(6)          | 3.3<br>(15)         | 10.6 (116)             | (221)                  |
| T <sub>8</sub> - Weedy check                                  |               |                     | 21.1<br>(535)         | 15.5<br>(243)                 | 4.8<br>(36)         | 3.3<br>(15)         | 4.0<br>(19)        | 8.1<br>(71)         | 4.3<br>(21)       | 4.9<br>(29)         | 9.0<br>(81)        | 8.3<br>(73)        | 6.2<br>(44)        | 4.8<br>(30)        | 5.2<br>(63)         | 7.4<br>(62)         | 26.7<br>(817)          | 21.6                   |
| LSD (P=0.05)<br>Wheat   |               |                     | 7.1                   | 4.3                           | · · ·               | NS                  | NS                 | 3.1                 | 1.4               | 2.0                 | 4.9                | 3.3                | 1.6                | NS                 | NS                  | 2.6                 | 7.9                    | 4.9                    |
| S <sub>1</sub> - Weedy check                                  |               |                     | 9.4<br>(156)          | 9.6<br>(100)                  | 3.04<br>(15)        | 2.9<br>(12)         | 1.1<br>(0)         | 2.7<br>(14)         | 2.0<br>(5)        | 3.4<br>(17)         | 5.3<br>(49)        | 4.8<br>(35)        | 3.2<br>(18)        | 3.7<br>(19)        | 1.6<br>(3)          | 2.4<br>(10)         | 14.2<br>(258)          | 14.2<br>(219)          |
| S <sub>2</sub> - Isoproturon +<br>2,4-D                       | 1000<br>+ 500 | Post                | 10.9<br>(200)         | 10.1 (119)                    | 3.14<br>(17)        | 2.3<br>(8)          | 1.2<br>(1)         | 2.2 (7)             | 2.3<br>(8)        | 2.9<br>(13)         | 4.8<br>(41)        | 5.5<br>(40)        | 2.5 (10)           | 2.8 (11)           | 2.0<br>(8)          | 2.6<br>(10)         | 15.1<br>(294)          | 14.1                   |
| S <sub>3</sub> - Isoproturon +<br>2,4-D                       | 750 +<br>500  | Post                | 8.5<br>(133)          | 10.4<br>(128)                 | 2.72                | 2.8<br>(11)         | 1.4<br>(3)         | 2.1<br>(7)          | 1.8<br>(4)        | 2.6<br>(9)          | 4.4<br>(33)        | 4.3<br>(26)        | 2.3<br>(8)         | 2.6<br>(12)        | 2.0<br>(6)          | 2.7<br>(10)         | 12.6<br>(206)          | 13.7<br>(214)          |
| LSD (P=0.05)  |               |                     | NS                    | NS                            | NS                  | NS                  | NS                 | NS                  | NS                | NS                  | NS                 | NS                 | NS                 | NS                 | NS                  | NS                  | NS                     | NS                     |

Table 1. Effect of treatments on dry weight (g/m<sup>2</sup>) of weeds at 60 DAS in soybean

Values given in parentheses are the means of original values

| Table 2. | Effect of treatments or | n dry weight | (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) of weeds at | 60 DAS in wheat |
|----------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|
|----------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|

| Treatment             | Phal      | aris     | Ave      | ena      | Loli    | um      | Vid     | cia     | Total      |          |  |
|-----------------------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------------|----------|--|
|                       | 2009-10   | 2010-11  | 2009-10  | 2010-11  | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2009-10    | 2010-11  |  |
| Soybean               |           |          |          |          |         |         |         |         |            |          |  |
| $T_1$                 | 2.8 (8)   | 3.6 (14) | 3.4 (11) | 3.5 (13) | 1.2(0)  | 1.1 (0) | 1.2(1)  | 1.0(0)  | 4.5 (20)   | 5.2 (28) |  |
| $T_2$                 | 3.3 (14)  | 3.3 (11) | 4.1 (17) | 3.3 (11) | 1.1 (0) | 1.1 (0) | 1.0 (0) | 1.3 (1) | 5.3 (31)   | 4.8 (23) |  |
| <b>T</b> 3            | 4.3 (23)  | 4.2 (18) | 3.1 (9)  | 3.0 (8)  | 1.0(0)  | 1.4 (1) | 1.2(1)  | 1.1 (0) | 5.4 (32)   | 5.3 (28) |  |
| $T_4$                 | 4.1 (17)  | 3.7 (14) | 3.8 (18) | 3.5 (14) | 1.1 (0) | 1.1 (0) | 1.2(1)  | 1.4 (1) | 5.9 (36)   | 5.3 (29) |  |
| T5                    | 3.4 (11)  | 3.3 (11) | 3.0 (8)  | 3.4 (12) | 1.2(1)  | 1.2(1)  | 1.6(2)  | 1.4 (1) | 4.7 (22)   | 4.9 (24) |  |
| $T_6$                 | 9.6 (188) | 2.6(7)   | 4.0 (19) | 3.5 (16) | 1.1 (0) | 1.0(0)  | 1.4 (1) | 1.2(1)  | 11.4 (208) | 4.5 (23) |  |
| $T_7$                 | 2.6 (6)   | 4.1 (18) | 4.6 (29) | 3.7 (15) | 1.0(0)  | 1.4 (1) | 1.0(0)  | 1.5 (1) | 5.3 (35)   | 5.8 (35) |  |
| $T_8$                 | 2.4 (6)   | 4.8 (28) | 4.9 (24) | 4.6 (23) | 1.1 (0) | 1.1 (0) | 1.2(1)  | 1.1 (0) | 5.5 (31)   | 6.8 (51) |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | NS        | NS       | NS       | NS       | NS      | NS      | NS      | NS      | NS         | NS       |  |
| Wheat                 |           |          |          |          |         |         |         |         |            |          |  |
| $S_1$                 | 4.8 (49)  | 4.1 (20) | 4.3 (22) | 4.2 (20) | 1.2(0)  | 1.2(1)  | 1.5 (2) | 1.2(1)  | 7.1 (72)   | 6.1 (41) |  |
| <b>S</b> <sub>2</sub> | 3.5 (26)  | 3.1 (10) | 3.4 (12) | 3.1 (10) | 1.0(0)  | 1.2 (0) | 1.1(0)  | 1.3 (1) | 5.2 (38)   | 4.6 (21) |  |
| <b>S</b> <sub>3</sub> | 3.9 (28)  | 3.8 (15) | 3.8 (17) | 3.4 (12) | 1.1 (0) | 1.1 (0) | 1.2 (0) | 1.3 (1) | 5.8 (46)   | 5.3 (29) |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | 0.7       | 0.8      | 0.7      | 0.8      | NS      | NS      | 0.2     | NS      | 0.8        | 0.8      |  |

Values given in parentheses are the means of original values

1000 g/ha+2,4-D 500 g/ha behaving statistically alike with isoproturon 750 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha resulted in significantly lower dry matter accumulation of *Vicia sativa*. Application of isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha

behaving statistically similar to isoproturon 750 g/ha+2,4-D 500 g/ha resulted in significantly lower dry matter accumulation of *Coronopus didymus* at 90 DAS during 2010. Owing to species-wise reduction in dry weight, application of isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha and isoproturon 750 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha resulted in significantly lower total weed dry weight over weedy check. Similar results have been reported by Das and Yaduraju (1999) and Punia *et al.* (2004).

#### Nutrient removal by weeds

Soybean: There was tremendous reduction in the nutrient depletion under different weed control treatments. However, due to wide variation in nutrient content in weeds, nutrient removal by them was significantly influenced during 2010 only. All weed control treatments were significantly superior to weedy check in decreasing N and P removal by weeds. Among weed control treatments applied in soybean, pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl being at par to quizalofop-ethyl + chlorimuron-ethyl resulted in significantly lower nitrogen removal by weeds. Weeds removed 89.2% less nitrogen and 89.1% less phosphorus than unweeded check. Rests of the treatments being at par were comparable to hand weeding twice in depleting the soil for available nitrogen and phosphorus. Application of pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl resulted in significantly lowest potassium depletion by weeds. This treatment reduced potassium depletion by weeds by 88.9% due to effective weed control as compared to the unweeded check. Rests of the treatments were comparable to hand weeding twice in influencing potassium depletion by weeds. Weeds have considerably depleted the soil for N, P and K in weedy check mainly because of higher dry weight of weeds in these plots. Similar results have been reported by Kumar and Das (2008), Singh et al. (2006a) and Pasal and Sagarka (2013). Treatments in wheat could not significantly influence nutrient depletion by weeds in soybean.

*Wheat*: Similar to weed dry weight, treatments in soybean did not significantly influence nutrient uptake by weeds in wheat. Inspite of having significant reduction in weed dry weight, N, P and K uptake by weeds in wheat was not significantly influenced due to weed control treatments in wheat. This clearly indicated vide variation in the content of nutrients in weeds. The application of isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha reduced N, P and K depletion by 24.2 and 24.8 and 21.1 and 24.1% over the unweeded check during 2009 and 2010, respectively.

Soybean + wheat system: Mean nutrient depletion by weeds under soybean – wheat cropping system was significantly affected due to treatments in soybean. Weeds in unweeded check removed 71.5 kg of N, 6.9 kg of P and 97.4 kg of K, thus depriving crops for that much amount of available nutrients. Out of this total removal by weeds more than 65% depletion of NPK (*i.e.* 66.7% N, 72.2% P and 65.4% K in soybean) occurred during *Kharif*. Application of pendimethalin *fb* chlorimuron could save 48.1 kg N, 9.9 kg P and 66 kg K/ha from being depleted by weeds under soybean – wheat cropping system. Treatments in wheat also brought about significant variation in total NPK depletion by weeds in soybean – wheat cropping system. Isoproturon 0.7-1.00 kg/ha + 2,4-D 0.50 kg/ha significantly reduced total N, P and K depletion by weeds in soybean – wheat cropping system.

#### Nutrient uptake by crops

Soybean: Weed control treatments significantly increased the nitrogen uptake by soybean crop over unweeded check. In general, all the herbicide combinations were superior to alone application of herbicides in improving the nitrogen uptake by crop. Because of higher seed and straw yield, pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl resulted in significantly higher nitrogen uptake by crop during 2009. However, this treatment remained statistically similar with imazethapyr *fb* imazethapyr and quizalofop-ethyl + chlorimuron-ethyl during 2010. Application of pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl resulted in 187.5 and 52.7% higher nitrogen uptake over weedy check during 2009 and 2010, respectively. P and K content showed variation and therefore their uptake by soybean crop was not significantly affected under weed control treatments in soybean during 2010. Pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl remaining at par with imazethapyr *fb* imazehapyr and handweeding twice resulted in significantly higher P uptake by soybean over other treatments. Herbicides alone were alike to hand weeding twice in influencing P uptake by soybean crop. Unchecked weed growth reduced phosphorus uptake in soybean by 62.4% as compared to pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl.

Similar trend as that of P uptake was observed with respect to K uptake in soybean during 2009. Pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl recorded 166.3% higher potassium uptake by soybean than unweeded check. However, this treatment behaved statistically alike to imazethapyr fb imazethapyr and hand weeding (twice). Higher dry matter accumulation by soybean with application of pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl may be attributed to better root spread and penetration in soil due to weed free environment. Also, lower N, P and K removal by weeds allowed soybean to grow more vigorously and accumulated more biomass, which consequently led to higher uptake of these nutrients (Kumar and Dass 2008 and Singh *et al.* 2006). Treatments in wheat did not significantly influence nutrients uptake by soybean during both the years.

#### Navell Chander, Suresh Kumar, Ramesh and Surinder Singh Rana

Table 3. Effect of treatments on nutrient uptake (kg/ha) by weeds

|                       |      | Soybean |      |      |      |      |             |             | Total*      |             |             |             |      |      |      |
|-----------------------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|------|------|
|                       | N P  |         | Р    | K    |      | Ν    |             | Р           |             | K           |             |             |      |      |      |
| Treatment             | 2009 | 2010    | 2009 | 2010 | 2009 | 2010 | 2009-<br>10 | 2010-<br>11 | 2009-<br>10 | 2010-<br>11 | 2009-<br>10 | 2010-<br>11 | Ν    | Р    | K    |
| Soybean               |      |         |      |      |      |      |             |             |             |             |             |             |      |      |      |
| T <sub>1</sub>        | 27.2 | 27.8    | 6.0  | 5.0  | 44.4 | 36.0 | 24.3        | 22.0        | 3.6         | 3.3         | 31.3        | 29.7        | 50.7 | 9.0  | 70.7 |
| $T_2$                 | 19.8 | 28.2    | 4.7  | 5.2  | 30.9 | 33.1 | 21.9        | 17.7        | 3.7         | 2.6         | 29.4        | 23.2        | 43.8 | 8.1  | 58.3 |
| T3                    | 31.5 | 25.0    | 5.7  | 4.7  | 39.1 | 32.2 | 17.2        | 20.1        | 2.7         | 3.2         | 23.2        | 27.2        | 46.9 | 8.2  | 60.9 |
| $T_4$                 | 17.0 | 20.1    | 3.5  | 3.9  | 25.4 | 25.3 | 19.9        | 21.1        | 3.0         | 3.3         | 25.7        | 29.0        | 39.1 | 6.9  | 52.7 |
| T5                    | 21.5 | 14.1    | 4.5  | 2.7  | 34.0 | 19.2 | 18.8        | 18.8        | 2.9         | 2.8         | 24.5        | 24.3        | 36.6 | 6.5  | 51.0 |
| T <sub>6</sub>        | 5.2  | 5.8     | 1.3  | 1.1  | 7.2  | 7.9  | 18.1        | 17.6        | 2.7         | 2.8         | 23.5        | 24.2        | 23.4 | 4.0  | 31.4 |
| T7                    | 9.0  | 20.6    | 1.6  | 4.0  | 11.6 | 27.4 | 30.1        | 21.6        | 4.8         | 3.4         | 41.2        | 28.7        | 40.7 | 6.9  | 54.5 |
| $T_8$                 | 41.8 | 53.5    | 9.8  | 10.2 | 61.8 | 71.4 | 27.2        | 20.4        | 4.5         | 3.2         | 35.0        | 26.5        | 71.5 | 13.9 | 97.4 |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | NS   | 9.1     | NS   | 1.8  | NS   | 10.3 | NS          | NS          | NS          | NS          | NS          | NS          | 8.6  | 2.9  | 10.2 |
| Wheat                 |      |         |      |      |      |      |             |             |             |             |             |             |      |      |      |
| $S_1$                 | 25.1 | 24.6    | 5.5  | 4.6  | 37.0 | 31.6 | 25.6        | 23.1        | 4.1         | 3.5         | 33.8        | 30.8        | 49.2 | 8.9  | 66.6 |
| $S_2$                 | 20.8 | 24.1    | 4.5  | 4.6  | 29.9 | 30.8 | 19.4        | 17.4        | 3.1         | 2.8         | 26.2        | 23.4        | 40.9 | 7.5  | 55.2 |
| <b>S</b> <sub>3</sub> | 19.0 | 24.5    | 3.9  | 4.6  | 28.6 | 32.3 | 21.6        | 19.2        | 3.3         | 3.0         | 27.7        | 25.5        | 42.2 | 7.4  | 57.1 |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | NS   | NS      | NS   | NS   | NS   | NS   | NS          | NS          | NS          | NS          | NS          | NS          | 2.5  | 0.9  | 3.5  |

\*Mean of two years

## Table 4. Effect of treatments on nutrient uptake (kg/ha) by crops

|                |       | Soybean |      |      |       |       |       |       | Wh    | Total* |       |       |       |      |       |
|----------------|-------|---------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|
| Treatment      | 1     | N       |      | P K  |       | K N   |       | ١     | Р     |        | Κ     |       |       |      |       |
| Treatment      | 2009  | 2010    | 2009 | 2010 | 2009  | 2010  | 2009- | 2010- | 2009- | 2010-  | 2009- | 2010- | Ν     | Р    | Κ     |
|                |       |         |      |      |       |       | 10    | 11    | 10    | 11     | 10    | 11    |       |      |       |
| Soybean        |       |         |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |       |       |      |       |
| $T_1$          | 110.3 | 116.8   | 12.9 | 14.0 | 125.8 | 138.9 | 134.5 | 125.8 | 24.9  | 25.5   | 149.2 | 155.7 | 243.7 | 38.7 | 284.8 |
| $T_2$          | 106.4 | 123.9   | 13.0 | 14.7 | 126.6 | 150.1 | 123.5 | 122.8 | 23.4  | 23.8   | 139.2 | 144.3 | 238.3 | 37.5 | 280.1 |
| $T_3$          | 110.0 | 124.2   | 12.6 | 14.3 | 122.6 | 141.5 | 124.0 | 120.7 | 22.1  | 22.8   | 135.1 | 148.6 | 239.5 | 35.9 | 273.9 |
| $T_4$          | 142.4 | 140.3   | 16.6 | 16.8 | 151.5 | 151.6 | 144.3 | 130.6 | 27.2  | 27.8   | 163.7 | 165.4 | 278.8 | 44.2 | 316.1 |
| $T_5$          | 133.6 | 138.8   | 14.6 | 16.0 | 140.8 | 155.5 | 128.8 | 117.5 | 24.5  | 24.6   | 144.4 | 150.0 | 259.4 | 39.9 | 295.4 |
| $T_6$          | 170.2 | 148.7   | 20.5 | 15.4 | 192.8 | 148.6 | 134.3 | 133.0 | 25.9  | 25.4   | 147.1 | 170.4 | 293.1 | 43.6 | 329.5 |
| $T_7$          | 136.0 | 129.4   | 16.2 | 14.7 | 150.3 | 138.9 | 143.1 | 122.0 | 25.3  | 23.1   | 156.7 | 137.2 | 265.3 | 39.7 | 291.6 |
| $T_8$          | 59.2  | 97.4    | 7.7  | 12.3 | 72.4  | 130.8 | 122.6 | 108.3 | 22.7  | 21.4   | 129.8 | 131.4 | 193.8 | 32.1 | 232.2 |
| LSD (P=0.05)   | 36.45 | 12.10   | 4.95 | NS   | 50.09 | NS    | NS    | NS    | NS    | NS     | NS    | NS    | 27.3  | 5.5  | 40.0  |
| Wheat          |       |         |      |      |       |       |       |       |       |        |       |       |       |      |       |
| $\mathbf{S}_1$ | 118.3 | 126.3   | 13.9 | 14.6 | 131.1 | 144.1 | 117.2 | 109.4 | 21.2  | 21.4   | 131.4 | 136.2 | 235.6 | 35.6 | 271.4 |
| $S_2$          | 120.5 | 128.7   | 14.2 | 15.0 | 138.2 | 144.1 | 143.9 | 130.5 | 26.5  | 26.1   | 157.4 | 156.7 | 261.8 | 40.9 | 298.2 |
| $S_3$          | 124.3 | 127.3   | 14.7 | 14.8 | 136.8 | 145.3 | 134.6 | 127.8 | 25.8  | 25.4   | 148.1 | 157.8 | 257.0 | 40.4 | 294.0 |
| LSD (P=0.05)   | NS    | NS      | NS   | NS   | NS    | NS    | 11.36 | 8.44  | 2.20  | 1.72   | 12.88 | 12.97 | 7.9   | 1.5  | 12.9  |

\*Mean of two years

*Wheat*: Weed control treatments in soybean did not bring about significant variation in uptake of N, P and K by wheat. Weed control treatments in wheat resulted in significant variation in NPK uptake by wheat. Application of isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha behaving statistically alike with isoproturon 750 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha resulted in significantly higher N, P and K uptake over unweeded check. The higher nutrient uptake can be as-

cribed to more grain and straw yield under isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha and isoproturon 750 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha. Similar results have been reported by Pandey *et al.* (2007) and Bharat and Kachroo (2007). Higher dry matter accumulation by wheat under herbicidal treatments might have increased the nutrient uptake (Brar and Walia 2009 and Pandey *et al.* 2001).

Nutrient removal by weeds and crops as affected by herbicide combinations in soybean-wheat cropping system

| Treatment      |      | an seed<br>(t/ha) | •    | equivalent<br>eld |       | eturn<br>₹/ha) | Net returns/₹<br>invested |      |  |
|----------------|------|-------------------|------|-------------------|-------|----------------|---------------------------|------|--|
|                | 2009 | 2009              | 2009 | 2010              | 2009  | 2010           | 2009                      | 2010 |  |
| Soybean        |      |                   |      |                   |       |                |                           |      |  |
| $\dot{T}_1$    | 1.33 | 1.33              | 2.80 | 2.72              | 65.52 | 68.13          | 1.45                      | 1.51 |  |
| $T_2$          | 1.34 | 1.34              | 2.69 | 2.79              | 61.56 | 69.49          | 1.37                      | 1.55 |  |
| $T_3$          | 1.38 | 1.38              | 2.69 | 2.76              | 61.52 | 68.28          | 1.38                      | 1.53 |  |
| $T_4$          | 1.79 | 1.79              | 3.34 | 3.15              | 83.60 | 82.61          | 1.87                      | 1.85 |  |
| T <sub>5</sub> | 1.67 | 1.67              | 3.10 | 2.89              | 75.23 | 75.73          | 1.69                      | 1.70 |  |
| $T_6$          | 1.87 | 1.87              | 3.30 | 3.16              | 85.09 | 85.16          | 1.88                      | 1.88 |  |
| T <sub>7</sub> | 1.63 | 1.63              | 3.11 | 2.94              | 73.67 | 64.80          | 1.49                      | 1.32 |  |
| $T_8$          | 0.75 | 0.75              | 2.09 | 2.25              | 40.43 | 45.49          | 0.91                      | 1.02 |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)   | 0.43 | 0.43              | 0.59 | 0.35              | 22.10 | 14.57          | 0.49                      | 0.31 |  |
| Wheat          |      |                   |      |                   |       |                |                           |      |  |
| $S_1$          | 1.45 | 1.45              | 2.72 | 2.69              | 61.41 | 64.11          | 1.36                      | 1.42 |  |
| $S_2$          | 1.43 | 1.43              | 2.96 | 2.97              | 72.18 | 73.85          | 1.58                      | 1.62 |  |
| $S_3$          | 1.53 | 1.53              | 2.99 | 2.84              | 71.39 | 71.92          | 1.57                      | 1.58 |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)   | NS   | NS                | 0.17 | 0.11              | 6.22  | 4.10           | 0.14                      | 0.09 |  |

| Table 5. Effect of treatments on soybean seed yield (t/ha), soybean equivalent yield (t/ha), net           |
|--|
| returns ( $\overline{\mathbf{x}}$ /ha) and net returns per rupee invested in soybean-wheat cropping system |

Soybean + wheat: Treatments in soybean significantly affected total NPK uptake in soybean – wheat cropping system. Under weedy check, crop uptake was only 193.8 kg N, 32.1 kg P and 232.2 kg K which increased to 293.1 kg N, 43.6 kg P and 329.5 kg K under the best treatment *i.e.* pendimethalin *fb* chlorimuron-ethyl. However, uptake of nutrients by the cropping system was tremendously higher than the recommend application rate even in the weedy check. The upake by weeds was extra. The all other treatments were also superior to weedy check in increasing N and K uptake by soybean – wheat cropping system. Treatments in wheat significantly influenced total N, P and K uptake by soybean – wheat system. Application of 0.75-1.00 kg/ha + 2,4-D 0.50 kg/ha significantly increased to-tal NPK uptake by soybean – wheat cropping system.

### System productivity

Application of pendimethalin fb chlorimuron-ethyl remaining statistically at par to imazethapyr fb imazethapyr, quizalofop-ethyl + chlorimuron-ethyl and hand weeding (twice) resulted in significantly higher soybean seed yield. Weeds in weedy check reduced the seed yield of soybean by 59.9 and 41.0% during 2009 and 2010, respectively as compared to pendimethalin fb chlorimuron ethyl. Mishra and Singh (2009) have reported 86% reduction in seed yield of soybean due to weeds. There were no residual effects of treatments applied in wheat on seed yield of soybean as the treatments were not significantly different. Herbicide combinations and hand weeding twice were better than herbicides alone in influencing soybean equivalent yield (Table 5). During 2009, pendimethalin alone was also at par with herbicide combinations. Application of imazethapyr *fb* imazethapyr produced higher soybean equivalent yield (3.34 t/ha) during 2009, whereas during 2010, application of pendimethalin *fb* chlorimuron (3.16t/ha) was better. Weedy check reduced soybean equivalent yield by 37.4 and 28.8% during 2009 and 2010, respectively. Among treatments in wheat, application of isoproturon 0.75 kg/ha + 2,4-D 0.50 kg/ha and isoproturon 1000 g/ha+ 2,4-D 500 g/ha was statistically similar in influencing soybean equivalent yield over weedy check during 2009. During 2010, application of isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha produced highest soybean equivalent yield (2.97 t/ha).

## Profitability

Pendimethalin *fb* chlorimuron remaining at par with pendimethalin, imazethapyre *fb* imazethapyre, quizalofop + chlorimuron and hand weeding twice during 2009 and imazethapyre *fb* imazethapyre and quizalofop + chlorimuron during 2010 resulted significantly higher net returns (₹ 85,096, 85,165) and net returns per rupee invested (1.88 and 1.88). Among treatments in wheat, isoproturon 1000 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha (₹ 1,17,736 and 1.60) and isoproturon 750 g/ha + 2,4-D 500 g/ha (₹ 1,16,861 and 1.58) remaining statistically at par resulted in higher net returns and net return per rupee invested as compared to weedy check.

#### REFERENCES

- Bharat R and Kachroo D. 2007. Bio-efficacy of various herbicides and their mixtures on weeds and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) under sub-tropical agro-ecosystem. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **52**(1): 53-59.
- Brar AS and Walia US. 2009. Weed dynamics and wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) productivity techniques and weed control practices. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **41**(3&4): 161-166.
- Buriro UA, Oad FC, Agha SK and Solangi GS. 2003. Post emergence weed control in wheat. *Journal of Applied Sciences* **3**(6): 424-427.
- Das TK and Yaduraju NT. 1999. Effect of weed competition on growth, nutrient uptake and yield of wheat as affected by irrigation and fertilizers. *Journal of Agricultural Science, Cambridge* **133**(1): 45-51.
- Jadhav AS and Gadade GD. 2012. Evaluation of post-emergence herbicides in soybean. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **44**(4): 259-260.
- Kumar M and Das TK. 2008. Integrated weed management for system productivity and economics in soybean (*Glycine max*)wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) systems. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **53**(3): 189-194.
- Kumar S, Angiras NN, Rana SS and Kumar AK. 2008. Evaluation of doses of some herbicides to manage weeds in soybean (*Glycine max* L.). *Indian Journal Weed Science* **40**(1&2): 56-61.
- Mishra JS and Singh VP. 2009. Weed dynamics and productivity of soybean (*Glycine max*)–based cropping systems as influenced by tillage and weed management. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* 53(1): 29-35.
- Pandey IB, Sharma SL, Tiwari S and Bharati V. 2001. Effect of tillage and weed management on grain yield and nutrient removal by wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) and weeds. *Indian Journal* of Weed Science 33(3&4): 107-111.

- Pandey KA, Joshi OP and Billore SD. 2007. Effect of herbicidal weed control on weed dynamics and yield of soybean [*Glycine* max (L.) Merrill]. Soybean Research 5: 26-32.
- Pisal RR and Sagarka BK. 2013. Integrated weed management in wheat with new molecules. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 45(1): 25-28.
- Punia SS, Malik RK and Shoeren P. 2004. Bioefficacy of tank mix combinations of fenoxaprop and clodinafop with broad-leaved herbicides for broad spectrum weed control in wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). *Indian Journal of Ecology* **31**: 128-132.
- Rajput RL and Kushwah SS. 2004. Integrated weed management in soybean on farmers filed. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 36(3&4): 210-212.
- Singh P, Nepalia V and Tomar SS. 2006a. Effect of weed control and nutrient management on soybean (*Glycine max*) productivity. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **51**(4): 314-317.
- Singh R, Kalia BD and Negi PS. 1992. Integrated weed management in soybean. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 24 (1&2): 93-95.
- Singh R, Tomar SS and Kumar A. 2006. Integrated weed management in wheat. Crop Research 32(3): 289-293.
- Upadhyay VB, Bharti V and Anay Rawat. 2012. Bioefficacy of postemergence herbicides in soybean. *Indian Journal of Weed Sci*ence **44**(4): 261-263.
- Upadhyay VB, Singh A and Anay Rawat. 2013. Efficacy of early post-emergence herbicides against associated weeds in soybean. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **45**(1): 73-75.
- Verma S and Sharma PK. 2007. Effect of long-term manuring and fertilizers on carbon pools, soil structure and sustainability under different cropping systems in wet-temperate zone of north-west Himalayas. *Biology and Fertility of Soils* 44(1): 235-240.



## Effect of nitrogen and weed control on productivity of wheat

R.R. Upasani\*, R. Thakur, A.N. Puran and M.K. Singh

Department of Agronomy, Birsa Agricultural University, Ranchi, Jharkhand 834 006

Received: 13 January 2013; Revised: 16 April 2013

## ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted during winter season of 2005-06 and 2006-07 to evaluate the effect of nitrogen levels and weed control on weed growth, productivity and economics of wheat. The treatments comprised of 4 levels of nitrogen, *viz.* 0, 40, 80, and 120 kg/ha in main plots and 5 weed control methods, *viz.* weedy control, 2,4-D Na 0.75 kg/ha as post-emergence, isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha + 2,4-D Na 0.75 kg/ha as post-emergence and weeding by Dutch hoe at 15, 30 and 45 days after sowing. Maximum density and dry weight were recorded with 120 kg N/ha and minimum under N<sub>0</sub>. Increasing levels of nitrogen from 0 to 40, 40 to 80 and 80 to 120 kg/ha increased weed density by 33.7, 39.9 and 47.3% and weed dry matter by 35.2, 24.9 and 13.5%, respectively while N up take by 68.8, 56.7 and 18.7% phosphorus 13.2, 4.6 and 4.4% and potassium 16.2, 7.0 and 8.7% over preceding lower levels. 120 kg N/ha recorded significantly higher grain (2.90 t/ha) and straw (4.6 t/ha) yield, net return (₹ 26,616/ha) and B:C ratio (1.52).

Key words: Economics Nutrient up take, Weed control efficiency, Weed dry matter, Weed population

Generally weeds are considered harmful plants and are one of the biggest threats to agriculture. They use the soil fertility, available nutrients and moisture and compete for space and sunlight with the crop plants. This not only results in yield reduction but also deteriorates the quality of the produce, hence reducing the market value of crops (Heyne 1987). It has been estimated that crop losses due to weed competition throughout the world as a whole are greater than those resulting from the combined effects of insect pests and diseases (Khan et al. 2005). Fertilization is an important agronomic strategy used extensively to increase crop yield. Nevertheless, although nutrients clearly promote crop growth, many studies have shown that in some cases, fertilizers benefit weeds more than crops (DiTomaso 1995). For example, Carlson and Hill (1986) found that addition of N fertilizer to wild oat-infested wheat increased the density of wild oat panicles without increasing crop yield. However, Satorre EH and RW Snaydon (1992) showed that N fertilizer reduced the severity of competition experienced by wild oat from six spring cereals. The increase in weed competition at higher N rates has been suggested to be related to an increase in the efficiency of nutrient accumulation and use by weeds. The weeds removed significantly higher quantity of nitrogen, phosphorus and potash from plots receiving 120 kg N/ha than from those receiving lower levels of nitrogen.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during winter season of 2005-06 and 2006-07 to evaluate the effect of weed management and nitrogen levels on weed growth and productivity of wheat. The treatments comprised of 4 levels of nitrogen, viz. 0, 40, 80, and 120 kg/ha in main plots and 5 weed control methods, viz. weedy control, isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha as post-emergence, 2,4-D Na salt 0.75 kg/ha as post-emergence and weeding by Dutch hoe at 15, 30 and 45 days after sowing. Wheat variety 'K 9107' with 120 kg/ha seed rate was sown on 6th November, 2005 and 10th November, 2006, receiving 60 kg  $P_2O_5$  and 40 kg  $K_2O/ha$ . Nitrogen 40 kg/ha was applied in single dose basal, whereas 80 kg/ha was applied in 2 splits - half basal + half at tillering stage; and 120 kg N/ha was applied in 3 splits, one third each at basal, tillering and at flowering. All herbicides were applied at post-emergence stage at 30 days after sowing using spray volume of 500 l/ha. Weeds were collected at randomly placing 50 x 50 cm quadrant in each plot. Weeds were cut from ground level and then identified, counted and samples were kept in an oven at  $65\pm5^{\circ}C$  until they attained constant weight. The data on weeds were square root transformed ( $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ ) for statistical analysis (Panse and Sukhatme 1967).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### Effect on weed

Weed flora of the experimental field consisted mainly *Loilium temulentum* and *Avena fatua* among grasses and

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: upasani.ravikant@gmail.com

#### Chenopodium album, Anagalis arvensis, Vicia sativa, Ageratum conzoides, Medicago polymorpha and Oxalis corniculata among broad-leaved weeds

Significant increase in weed density and dry matter accumulation at 90 days after sowing was observed with increase in each nitrogen level. Maximum density and dry weight were recorded with 120 kg N/ha and minimum under  $N_0$ . Increasing levels of N from 0 to 40, 40 to 80 and 80 to 120 kg/ha increased weed density by 33.7, 39.9 and 47.3% and weed dry matter by 35.2, 24.9 and 13.5%, respectively (Table 1). The significant increase in weed population and dry matter accumulation might be due to utilization of soil applied nitrogen in greater quantity by weeds, resulting in more growth and high dry matter accumulation. All weed control measures significantly reduced the weed density and dry weight of weeds at 90 days after sowing compared with weedy control. Weeding by Dutch hoe at 15, 30 and 45 days after sowing being similar to post-emergence application of isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha + 2,4-D Na 0.75 kg/ha proved most effective in arresting the population of weeds and dry matter accumulation. The highest weed control efficiency (86.1%) was recorded under weeding by Dutch hoe at 15, 30 and 45 days after

sowing closely followed by isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha + 2,4-D Na 0.75 kg/ha post-emergence (84.1%). Similar results were also observed by Rajput *et al.* (1993).

#### Nutrient uptake by weeds and crop

The weeds removed significantly higher quantity of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium from plots receiving 120 kg N/ha than from receiving lower levels of nitrogen. Increasing level of nitrogen from 0 to 40, 40 to 80 and 80 to 120 kg/ha increased nitrogen uptake by 68.8, 56.7 and 18.7% phosphorus 13.2, 4.6 and 4.4% and potassium 16.2, 7.0 and 8.7% over preceding lower levels (Table 1). It appeared that higher nitrogen application favored higher weed population and weed dry matter production resulting in higher nutrient uptake while under control treatment (0 kg N/ha) nutrient uptake was less owing to less availability of nitrogen resulting lower weed density and weed dry matter. Sankpal and Mahalle (1991) also reported similar finding.

All weed control treatments reduced the nitrogen, phosphorus and potash uptake by weeds significantly compared to weedy control. Weeding by Dutch hoe being comparable to isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha + 2, 4-D Na 0.75 kg/ha

|                       | Weed                                | Dry     | Weed |      | Nutr  | ient u | ptake | (kg/ha | ι)   | Yield | Gross                        | Net                                       | D.C   |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|------|------|-------|--------|-------|--------|------|-------|------------------------------|---|-------|
| Treatment             | density/m <sup>2</sup><br>at 90 DAS |         |      |      | Weeds |        |       | Wheat  |      |       | returns (x 10 <sup>3</sup> ₹ | returns B:C<br>(x 10 <sup>3</sup> ₹ ratio |       |
|                       |                                     | 90 DAS  | (%)  | N    | Р     | K      | N     | Р      | K    |       | /ha)                         | /ha)                                      |       |
| N (kg/ha)             |                                     |         |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| No                    | 5.34                                | 5.12    | 74.8 | 9.3  | 3.8   | 3.7    | 14.5  | 3.5    | 1.5  | 0.09  | 1.44                         | -14.55                                    | -0.91 |
|                       | (28.5)                              | (26.1)  |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| N40                   | 6.17                                | 5.95    | 66.0 | 15.7 | 4.3   | 4.3    | 29.6  | 6.1    | 18.2 | 1.11  | 16.23                        | -0.26                                     | -0.02 |
|                       | (38.1)                              | (35.3)  |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| N80                   | 7.30                                | 6.80    | 57.8 | 24.6 | 4.5   | 4.6    | 69.6  | 18.2   | 42.5 | 2.82  | 41.17                        | 24.14                                     | 1.42  |
|                       | (53.3)                              | (43.8)  |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| N120                  | 8.89                                | 7.65    | 52.1 | 29.2 | 4.7   | 5.0    | 73.7  | 21.6   | 48.6 | 2.90  | 44.17                        | 26.61                                     | 1.52  |
|                       | (78.5)                              | (49.7)  |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | 0.82                                | 0.79    | -    | 3.8  | 0.17  | 0.38   | 3.85  | 3.8    | 6.8  | 0.14  | 3.10                         | 2.50                                      | 0.82  |
| Weed control          |                                     |         |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha | 6.82                                | 5.58    | 70.0 | 17.2 | 4.5   | 3.2    | 46.4  | 12.5   | 29.6 | 1.93  | 28.44                        | 12.56                                     | 0.79  |
|                       | (46.5)                              | (31.1)  |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| 2,4-D 1.0 kg/ha       | 6.43                                | 5.28    | 73.2 | 18.5 | 3.5   | 2.4    | 42.9  | 11.4   | 27.5 | 1.74  | 25.30                        | 9.58                                      | 0.61  |
|                       | (41.3)                              | (27.8   |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha | 4.92                                | 4.06    | 84.1 | 10.5 | 2.2   | 1.5    | 59.7  | 17.0   | 36.8 | 2.20  | 33.06                        | 16.98                                     | 1.06  |
| + 2,4-D 1.0 kg/ha     | (24.2)                              | (16.5)  |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| Weeding by Dutch hoe  | 4.78                                | 3.80    | 86.1 | 9.9  | 2.5   | 1.2    | 60.7  | 18.6   | 40.2 | 2.37  | 35.32                        | 14.49                                     | 0.69  |
|                       | (21.0)                              | (14.4)  |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| Weedy control         | 10.72                               | 10.19   | -    | 42.5 | 9.5   | 13.5   | 24.5  | 2.3    | 4.6  | 0.43  | 6.64                         | -8.68                                     | -6.64 |
|                       |                                     | (103.8) |      |      |       |        |       |        |      |       |                              |   |       |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | 1.48                                | 1.40    | -    | 6.3  | 0.84  | 0.95   | 4.7   | 3.9    | 4.5  | 0.02  | 2.36                         | 2.13                                      | 0.26  |

Table 1. Effect of nitrogen level and weed control on weed growth, nutrient uptake, yield and economics of wheat

Data in parentheses denote original values; Price of wheat: grain ₹ 12/kg, straw - ₹ 2/kg
Table 2. Interaction effect of nitrogen and weed control treatments on grain yield of wheat (t/ha)

|   | Nitrogen (kg/ha) |          |                 |       |  |  |  |  |
|---|------------------|----------|-----------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| Treatment                               | N <sub>0</sub>   | $N_{40}$ | N <sub>80</sub> | N 120 |  |  |  |  |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha                   | 1.05             | 1.05     | 3.27            | 3.32  |  |  |  |  |
| 2,4-D 1.0 kg/ha                         | 0.075            | 0.94     | 2.84            | 3.12  |  |  |  |  |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha + 2,4-D 1.0 kg/ha | 0.090            | 1.54     | 3.63            | 3.53  |  |  |  |  |
| Weeding by Dutch hoe                    | 1.22             | 1.77     | 3.75            | 3.84  |  |  |  |  |
| Weedy control                           | 0.080            | 0.28     | 0.64            | 0.72  |  |  |  |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)                            |                  | 398      |                 |       |  |  |  |  |

post-emergence resulted in 76.7, 91.1 and 59.6% lower nitrogen, phosphorus and potash uptake by weeds compared to weedy control.

Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium uptake by wheat was maximum at 120 kg/ha and was at par with 80 kg/ha. Increasing nitrogen level from 0 to 40, 40 to 80, 80 to 120 kg/ha increased nitrogen uptake by 104, 135 and 5.89; phosphorus uptake by 69.8, 200.0 and 18.7 and potassium uptake by 1100, 133 and 14.3% over preceding lower levels of nitrogen. Among weed control methods, weeding by dutch hoe being at par with application of isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha+ 2,4-D 1.0 kg/ha recorded significantly higher nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium up take by wheat crop

## Grain yield

An increase in N level significantly increased grain yield of wheat only up to 80 kg/ha (2.84 t/ha). However, maximum grain yield of wheat (2.90 t/ha) was obtained in plots receiving 120 kg N/ha. All weed control treatments recorded significantly high grain yield compared to weed control. The grain yield with isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha + 2,4-D Na 0.75 kg/ha post-emergence (2.19 t/ha) was comparable with that of 3 weeding by Dutch hoe at 15, 30 and 45 days after sowing. The interaction effect of nitrogen levels and weed control treatments (Table 2) produced significant variation in grain yield. All weed control treatments responded only up to 80 kg N/ha in increasing the grain yield of wheat. Application of isoproturon 1.0 kg/ ha + 2,4-D 1.0 kg/ha or weeding by Dutch hoe at 15, 30 and 45 DAS along with 80 or 120 kg N/ha performed similarly in producing higher wheat grain yield as compared to other weed control and nitrogen combinations.

#### **Economics**

Application of 120 kg N/ha being at par with application of 80 kg N/ha recorded significantly higher net return( $\overline{<}$  26,616) and benefit cost ratio (1.52) as compared to 0 and 40 kg N/ha. Among weed control methods, application of isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha + 2,4-D 1.0 kg/ha registered significantly higher net return ( $\overline{<}$  16,980) and benefit cost ratio (1.06) as compared to isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha, 2,4-D 1.0 kg/ha and weeding by Dutch hoe at 15, 30 and 45 DAS.

- Carlson HL and Hill JE. 1986. Wild oat (*Avena fatua*) competition with spring wheat: effects of nitrogen fertilization. *Weed Science* **34**: 29-33.
- DiTomaso JM. 1995. Approaches for improving crop competitiveness through the manipulation of fertilization strategies. *Weed Science* **43**: 491-497.
- Heyne EG. 1987. *Wheat and Wheat Improvement*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Khan Bahadur Marwat, Muhammad Saeed, Zahid Hussain and Bakhtiar Gul. 2005. Chemical weed managent in rainfed areas. *Pakistan Journal of Weed Science Research* **11** (1-2): 31-36
- Rajput MJ, Alam SM and Rajput MS. 1993. Effect of weed control and N application on the growth of wheat. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research* 14 (2&3): 131-135.
- Sankpal AM and Mahalle SS. 1991. Studies on interaction between herbicide and levels of nitrogen in sunflower. *Journal Maharashtra Agricultural Universities* **16**: 323-324.
- Satorre EH and Snaydon RW. 1992. A comparison of root and shoot competition between spring cereals and *Avena fatua* L. *Weed Research* **32**: 45-55.



Indian Journal of Weed Science 45(2): 109–112, 2013

# Efficacy of herbicides on wheat and their terminal residues in soil, grain and straw

# Asha Arora\*, S.S. Tomar and Shobha Sondhia<sup>1</sup>

RVS Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, College of Agriculture, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh 474 002

Received: 5 March 2013; Revised: 26 May 2013

## ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted during *Rabi* season of 2006-07 and 2007-08 at Gwalior (M.P.) to evaluate the effect of herbicides on weed control and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivatum* L.) and residues of herbicides in post harvest soil, grain and straw of wheat. Ten treatments consisting of post emergence application of two doses of isoproturon (1.0 and 2.0 kg/ha), clodinafop- propargyl (60 and 120 g/ha), fenoxaprop -p-ethyl (60 and 120 g/ha) and sulfosulfuron (25 and 50 g/ha) along with two hand weeding and weedy control were evaluated in randomized block design with four replications. Samples of post harvest soil, grain and straw of wheat with higher dose of herbicides were analysed for herbicide residues by HPLC using PDA detector. Lowest weed population and weed dry weight at 60 days after sowing was recorded in isoproturon at both concentrations while lowest weed biomass at harvest and weed control efficiency was recorded in sulfosulfuron 25 g/ha followed by two hand weeding. Highest wheat yield (5.4 t/ha) was recorded in two hand weeding which was at par with sulfosulfuron 50 g/ha. clodinafop 60 g/ha, sulfosulfuron 25 g/ha and isoproturon 2.0 kg/ha. A reduction of 55.4% in wheat yield in weedy check was observed as compared to two hand weeding. A residue of 0.006, 0.041 and 0.022 µg/g isoproturon was in post harvest soil, wheat grain and straw while residues of 0.021 and 0.096 (µg g/g) clodinafop was present in soil and grain at higher level of application.

Key words: Clodinafop, Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl, Herbicide residue, Isoproturon, Sulfosulfuron, Weed dry weight, Weed population

Wheat (Triticum aestivatum L.) is the most important winter cereal crop of India. Isoproturon was recommended for weed control in wheat during 1980-81 and it became popular among the farmers. However, with the sole use of isoproturon continuously for a longer period, resistance in Phalaris minor to this herbicide was developed in Haryana (Malik and Singh 1993) and Punjab (Walia et al. 1997). Therefore, now a days, clodinafop, fenoxaprop-p-ethyl and sulfosulfuron are being recommended for efficient weed control in wheat (Chhonkar and Malik 2002) and are being used by farmers on large scale and are required in low doses. At the recommended dose of herbicide application, generally the problem does not arise and it selectively kills the weeds. But when the dose is more than recommended rates or due to indiscriminate use and improper calibration and method of application, there is possibility of residual hazards in soil and crop produced and can be harmful for human and animals. Keeping these in view, the study was under taken to assess the

efficacy of these herbicides on weeds in wheat and to find out the residues of these herbicides in post-harvest soil, grain and straw of wheat.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted during Rabi season of 2006-07 and 2007-08 at Research farm, College of Agriculture, Gwalior to evaluate the effect of herbicides on weed control and wheat productivity and residues of herbicides in post harvest soil, grain and straw of wheat. The experimental soil was sandy clay loam with 55.2% sand, 19.4% silt, 25.4% clay and 0.54% organic carbon having pH 7.2. Ten treatments consisting of isoproturon (1.0 and 2.0 kg/ha), clodinafop- propargyl (60 and 120 g/ ha), fenoxaprop-p-ethyl (60 and 120 g/ha), and sulfosulfuron (25 and 50 g/ha) along with two hand weeding (30 and 60 days after sowing) and weedy control were evaluated in randomized block design with four replications. The wheat crop variety MP 4010 was sown in rows 22.5cm apart on 19 and 17 November 2006 and 2007, respectively with recommended doses of nutrients (120 kg N, 26.2 kg P and 33.3 kg K/ha in both the years) applied to all the plots. The herbicides were sprayed as post emer-

<sup>\*</sup>**Corresponding author:** ashaaroragwl@gmail.com <sup>1</sup>Directorate of Weed Science Research, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh 482 004

gence 30 days after sowing (DAS) using a spray volume of 500 L/ha with a knapsack sprayer fitted with flat fan nozzle. Total rainfall received during crop season were 57.5 and 1.2 mm in first and second year respectively. The data on weed count and weed dry weight were recorded 60 DAS from an area enclosed in the quadrate of 0.25 m<sup>2</sup> at two places under each plot. Data on weed population were subjected to logarithmic transformation. Wheat yield and weed biomass were recorded at harvest. Soil, grain and straw samples of wheat were collected at the time of harvest and only samples with double the recommended herbicide were taken for quantitative residue analysis of herbicides. The soil, grain and straw samples were extracted for the herbicides as per the methods given by Sondhia (2006) and analyzed on a Shimadzu high performance liquid chromatography equipped with diode array detector at 206, 230, 235 and 215 nm and the retention time found was 4.6 min, 2.09 min, 2.15 min and 2.18 min for isoproturon, sulfosulforon, fenoxaprop and clodinafop respectively. Acetonitrile : water (70:30) was used as mobile phase with flow rate of 1 ml/min and detection limit 0.001 µg/g. The analysis was carried out in Residue Laboratory of Directorate of Weed Science Research, Jabalpur.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Effect on weeds

The experimental field was dominated by infestation of broad leaved weeds like *Spergula arvensis, Anagallis arvensis, Chenopodium album, Melilotus indica* and *Convolvulus arvensis*; grasses like *Phalaris minor* and sedges like *Cyperus rotundus*. The maximum mean weed population of two years was recorded in weedy check followed by fenoxaprop 240 g/ha and fenoxaprop 120 g/ha (Table 1). The lowest weed density was recorded in isoproturon

1.0 kg/ha which was at par with isoproturon 2.0 kg/ha, two hand weeding, clodinafop 60 and 120 g/ha and was found to be significantly lower than rest of the treatments. Weed dry weight reflects the growth potential of the weeds and its competitive ability with the crop plants. Weedy check recorded the highest weed dry weight while lowest weed dry weight was recorded in isoproturon 2.0 kg/ha followed by isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha, sulfosulfuron 50 g/ha and sulfosulfuron 25 g/ha. Dry weight of weeds under all herbicidal treatments and two hand weeding were at par to each other except fenoxaprop at both doses which was significantly higher than all weed control treatments. Although in most of the treatments, weed population and dry weight of weeds were recorded lower in the recommonded doses of herbicides as compared to double the recommonded, the differences were non significant. At harvest weed biomass was recorded lowest in sulfosulfuron 25 g/ha followed by two hand weeding, sulfosulfuron 50 g/ha, isoproturon 2.0 kg/ha and isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha (Table 2). Similar trend was observed for weed control efficiency with highest value recorded by sulfosulfuron 25 g/ha (95.2%) followed by two hand weeding (94.0%). It indicates that sulfosulfuron checks the growth of weeds more efficiently beyond 60 DAS as compared to isoproturon and other herbicides applied. Verma et al. (2007) found better weed control at 90 and 120 DAS by sulfosulfuron followed by fenoxaprop 100 g/ ha and isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha. In our study fenoxaprop @ 120 and 240 g/ha was not effective to control weeds as it resulted in significantly highest weed count and weed dry weight at 60 DAS and weed biomass at harvest.

# Effect on crop

Maximum mean grain yield of two year was recorded in two hand weeding (5.42 t/ha) treatment. Application of

Table 1. Effect of herbicidal treatment on population and dry weight of weeds in wheat

|                       | Wee          | d population/m | 2*           | Dry weight (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) |         |       |  |  |
|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------------------|---------|-------|--|--|
| Treatment             | 2006-07      | 2007-08        | Mean         | 2006-07                        | 2007-08 | Mean  |  |  |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha | 2.79 (16.2)  | 2.74 (15.0)    | 2.75 (15.6)  | 37.5                           | 24.1    | 30.8  |  |  |
| Isoproturon 2.0 kg/ha | 3.16 (23.0)  | 2.42 (12.0)    | 2.81 (17.5)  | 9.4                            | 13.5    | 11.5  |  |  |
| Clodinafop 60 g/ha    | 3.75 (44.2)  | 3.36 (30.5)    | 3.60 (37.3)  | 33.2                           | 48.5    | 40.8  |  |  |
| Clodinafop 120 g/ha   | 3.92 (51.7)  | 3.14 (23.0)    | 3.54 (37.3)  | 51.2                           | 41.8    | 46.5  |  |  |
| Fenoxaprop 120 g/ha   | 3.63 (44.5)  | 4.74 (127.5)   | 4.32 (86.0)  | 81.5                           | 204.3   | 142.9 |  |  |
| Fenoxaprop 240 g/ha   | 3.91 (51.0)  | 4.93 (150.5)   | 4.47 (100.7) | 114.5                          | 197.1   | 155.8 |  |  |
| Sulfosulfuron 25g/ha  | 3.86 (47.0)  | 3.85 (70.0)    | 4.05 (58.5)  | 30.5                           | 45.8    | 38.1  |  |  |
| Sulfosulfuron 50 g/ha | 3.51 (33.5)  | 3.87 (68.5)    | 3.87 (52.0)  | 45.3                           | 31.7    | 38.5  |  |  |
| Weedy check           | 5.19 (180.7) | 5.73 (291.2)   | 5.44 (235.9) | 204.5                          | 373.8   | 289.2 |  |  |
| Weed Free (Twice)     | 3.80 (48.0)  | 2.00 (7.2)     | 2.92 (27.6)  | 109.0                          | 8.7     | 58.8  |  |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | 0.56         | 0.80           | 0.76         | 69.9                           | 59.5    | 82.1  |  |  |

\*Data subjected to Logarithmic transformation. Figures in the parentheses are the original values

Table 2. Effect of different treatments on seed yield, weed biomass, weed control efficiency, net returns and B :C ratio in wheat

|                             | Seed yield (t/ha) |         |      | Weed bi | iomass at (kg/ha) | harvest | Mean of two years |                                     |      |  |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------|------|---------|-------------------|---------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------|--|
| Treatment                   | 2006-07           | 2007-08 | Mean | 2006-07 | 2007-08           | Mean    | WCE<br>(%)        | Net returns (x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | BCR  |  |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha (POE) | 4.29              | 3.79    | 4.04 | 117     | 173               | 145     | 89.0              | 36.97                               | 3.10 |  |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha (POE) | 4.95              | 4.19    | 4.57 | 110     | 163               | 136     | 89.7              | 43.56                               | 3.40 |  |
| Clodinafop 60 g/ha (POE)    | 5.50              | 3.89    | 4.70 | 83      | 315               | 199     | 84.9              | 43.53                               | 3.55 |  |
| Clodinafop 120 g/ha (POE)   | 3.55              | 4.14    | 3.85 | 58      | 272               | 165     | 87.5              | 33.19                               | 2.77 |  |
| Fenoxaprop 120 g/ha (POE)   | 2.72              | 3.46    | 3.09 | 418     | 986               | 702     | 46.9              | 23.71                               | 2.32 |  |
| Fenoxaprop 240 g/ha (POE)   | 2.26              | 2.74    | 2.50 | 517     | 1271              | 894     | 32.4              | 14.82                               | 1.78 |  |
| Sulfosulfuron 25 g/ha (POE) | 5.31              | 3.98    | 4.65 | 69      | 58                | 63      | 95.2              | 45.02                               | 3.54 |  |
| Sulfosulfuron 50 g/ha (POE) | 5.76              | 4.42    | 5.09 | 113     | 74                | 93      | 93.0              | 50.29                               | 3.72 |  |
| Weedy check                 | 2.38              | 2.46    | 2.42 | 775     | 1871              | 1323    | -                 | 15.64                               | 1.92 |  |
| Weed free                   | 5.63              | 5.22    | 5.42 | 137     | 22                | 79      | 94.0              | 52.03                               | 3.45 |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)                | 0.92              | 1.04    | 1.04 | 1111    | 403               | 798     | -                 | -                                   | -    |  |

sulfosulfuron 50 g/ha (5.09 t/ha), clodinafop 60 g/ha (4.6 t/ha), sulfosulfuron 25 g/ ha (4.6 t/ha) and IPU 2.0 kg/ha (4.5 t/ha) were at par with two hand weeding treatment in respect of grain yield and they were superior to all other treatments during both years. Better performance of these treatments in terms of yield could be owing to better control of complex weed flora tilting the crop weed competition in favour of the crop. Higher weed population and weed dry weight showed reduction of 55.42% grain yield (Table 2) in weedy check compared to hand weeding twice. In both the years fenoxaprop showed phytotoxicity as yellowing of plants at both the doses which was recovered after 70-80 DAS. Fenoxaprop at both doses failed to increase the seed yield significantly over weedy check possibly due to its lower WCE and phytotoxicity. Shukla and Mishra (2006) also found highest wheat grain yield in sulfosulfuron (25 g/ha) followed by clodinafop (60 g/ha), isoproturon (1.0 kg/ha) and fenoxaprop (90 g/ha) under bed planted late sown wheat.

# Economics

The economic analysis based on mean of two years (Table 2)indicated that maximum net return was obtained with two hand weeding ( $\overline{52},035$ ), followed by sulfosulfuron 50g/ha ( $\overline{50},287$ ) and sulfosulfuron 25g/ha ( $\overline{54},019$ ) while highest benefit cost ratio (BCR) was obtained with sulfosulfuron 50 g/ha (3.72) followed by clodinafop 60 g/ha (3.55), sulfosulfuron 25 g/ha (3.54) and two hand weeding (3.45).

# Herbicide residues

The analysis of terminal residue of herbicides in post harvest soil (Table 3) indicated that residue of 0.006 and 0.021 µg/g isoproturon and clodinofop respectively were detected in post harvest soil whereas no residues of fenoxaprop and sulfosulfuron were detected in soil. Similarly in wheat grain, isoproturon and clodinofop residues were present at the level of 0.041 and 0.096 µg/g, which were below the MRL (0.05 mg/kg for isoproturon and 0.1 mg/kg for clodinofop). In wheat grain sulfosulfuron residues were below detectable limit. In straw only isoproturon residue could be detected to the level of 0.022  $\mu$ g/g. Sondhia (2006) reported isoproturon and fenoxaprop residues in post harvest soil, grains and straw of wheat, while residues of sulfosulfuron were detected in wheat grain and straw only. Sulfosulfuron residues were not found in wheat grains, straw and subsequent vegetables in natural ecosystem as well as in model ecosystem at 25 and 50 g/ ha in wheat crop (Ramesh and Maheshwari, 2003; Sondhia et al. 2007). Chandi et al. (2005) also revealed that grains and straw of Durum wheat contained the residues of isoproturon and sulfosulfuron below the detectable limits. The residues of clodinofop (60-120 g/ha) were not detected in wheat grain and soil at harvest, however, 0.0089 ppm residues were detected in wheat grains at 240 g/ha (Sondhia and Mishra 2005).

Table 3. Residues of herbicides (µg/g) in post-harvest soil, grain and straw of wheat crop

| Herbicide             | Soil  | Grain | Straw |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| IPU 2.0 kg/ha         | 0.006 | 0.041 | 0.022 |
| Clodinafop 120 g/ha   | 0.021 | 0.096 | BDL   |
| Fenoxaprop 240 g/ha   | BDL   | ND    | ND    |
| Sulfosulfuron 50 g/ha | BDL   | BDL   | BDL   |

BDL - Below detectable limit (0.001 µg/g); ND - Not done

Efficacy of herbicides on wheat and their terminal residues in soil, grain and straw

- Chandi Aman, Sat Paul, Mehra SP, Randhawa SK and Saxena AK. 2005. Effect of herbicides on quality parameters and estimation of herbicide residue in grains and straw of Durum wheat (*Triticum durum* desf.) cultivars. pp. 309-311. In: *Extended Summaries*, Biennial Conference, Indian Society of Weed Science, PAU, Ludhiana, April 6-9, 2005.
- Chhonkar RS and Malik RK. 2002. Isoproturon resistance in *Phalaris minor* and its response to alternate herbicides. *Weed Technology* **16**; 116-123.
- Malik RK and Singh S. 1993. Evolving strategies for herbicide use in wheat : resistance and integrated weed management. pp 225-238. In: *Proceedings of International Symposium on Integrated weed Management for Sustainable. Agriculture*, 18-20 Nov. 1993. Hisar.
- Ramesh A and Maheshwari ST. 2003. Dissipation of sulfosulfuron in soil and wheat plant under predominant cropping conditions and in a simulated model ecosystem. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* **51**: 3396-3400.

- Shukla DK and Mishra OP. 2006. Efficacy of different herbicides in bed planted late-sown wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **38**(1&2): 12-15.
- Sondhia S. 2006. Herbicides residues in soil, water and food chain, Annual Report 2005-06. pp. 17-24. National Research Centre for Weed Science, Jabalpur.
- Sondhia S and Mishra JS. 2005. Determination of terminal residue of clodinafop-propargyl in soil, wheat grains and straw. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **37**: 296-297.
- Sondhia S, Singhai B and Singh VP. 2007. Degradation of sulfosulfuron in sandy clay loam soil and detection of its residues in wheat grains and straw. *Geobios* **34**: 74-76.
- Verma SK, Singh SB, Singh Ghansyam and Rai OP. 2007. Performance of varieties and herbicides on production potential of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) and associated weeds. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **39**(3&4): 230-233.
- Walia US, Brar LS and Dhaliwal BK. 1997. Resistance to isoproturon in *Phalaris minor* Ritz. in Punjab. *Plant Protection Quarterly* 12: 138-140.



Indian Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 113–115, 2013

# Weed management in lentil

R.B. Yadav\*, Vivek, R.V. Singh and K.G. Yadav

Department of Agronomy, S.V. Patel University of Agriculture & Technology, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh 250 110

Received: 3 April 2013; Revised: 30 May 2013

# ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted to explore the feasibility of growing lentil with integration of weed management practices using herbicide, increased plant population and manual weeding at Meerut during 2008-09 and 2009-10. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with four replications and ten treatments. The major weeds in experimental field were *Chenopodium album*, *Phalaris minor*, *Anagalis arvensis* and *Convolvulus arvensis* were recorded with some other minor weed species. Lowest weed density (4 m<sup>2</sup>) and dry weight (2.64 g/m<sup>2</sup>) was recorded where pendimethalin use applied 0.75 kg/ha as PE plus one hand weeding, which was statistically on par with pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. Whereas, the highest grain yield of 1662 kg/ha was recorded by pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha plus one hand weeding, which weed free as well as pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha. Increased seed rate of 25% significantly decreased the weed dry weight (32.0%) and increased seed yield (22.8%) in comparison to their respective treatments. On an average of 37.7% yield reduction was recorded due to weed infestation. The highest gross returns of ₹ 23,268, net returns of ₹ 15,918 and B:C was recorded by pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha PE + one hand weeding.

Key words: Chemical weed control, Integrated weed management, Lentil, Weed Management

Lentil is an important crop among *Rabi* pulses and usually grown on marginal and sub-marginal lands of western Uttar Pradesh without weed management. Presently not only the productivity and production are diminishing but area is also shrinking under this crop. Among various barriers like hungry and discarded soil, lack of promising cultivars, improper fertilization, pest, disease, poor weed management is the most important yield limiting factors. Weed reduces yield of lentil to the extent of 73% (Phogat *et al.* 2003). Mechanical/manual weeding is normally tedious, labour consuming and costlier. weed management, which includes use of herbicides and different planting methods, can prove more economical and beneficial in lentil crop.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted at Crop Research Station of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture & Technology, Meerut, during *Rabi* season of 2008-09 and 2009-10. Ten treatments consisted with pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha PE, pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha PE + 1 HW, isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha PE, isoproturon 0.75 kg/ ha PoE, isoproturon 0.75 kg/ha PoE + 1 HW, 25% more seed, 25% more seed + 1 HW, one hand weeding, weed

\*Corresponding author: raghvendra61@gmail.com

free check and weedy check were laid out in randomized block design with four replications. The soil of experimental site was loam in texture, normal in reaction (pH 7.8), low in nitrogen and phosphorus and medium in potassium status. Lentil variety '*PL-406*' was sown in last week of October during both the seasons of investigation. Recommended package of practices, except weed control treatments was adopted to grow the experimental crop. Herbicides were applied with knapsack foot sprayer fitted with flat fan nozzle. Species-wise weed population, their dry matter accumulations and finally seed yield and yield attributes were recorded.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Effect on weeds

The major weeds in experimental field were *Chenopodium album*, *Phalaris minor*, *Anagalis arvensis* and *Convolvulus arvensis* with some other minor weed species. The annual dicot weeds were dominant among the weed flora throughout the crop season during both the years. On an average of 37.7%, yield reduction was recorded due to weed infestation in comparison to weed free conditions. All the treatments of weed management practices proved significantly superior to weedy check in reducing weed density and dry matter at 90 DAS (Table

 Table 1. Effect of weed control treatments on density, dry weight and weed control efficiency (pooled data of two years)

|                                     | Spe                  | cies-wise v       | weed densit          | y (no./m <sup>2</sup> ) |                |                                   | Weed dry                      | Weed control      |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Treatment                           | Chenopodium<br>album | Phalaris<br>minor | Anagalis<br>arvensis | Convolvulus<br>arvensis | Other<br>weeds | Total weed density/m <sup>2</sup> | weight<br>(g/m <sup>2</sup> ) | efficiency<br>(%) |
| Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ ha PE         | 2.2 (4)              | 2.6 (6)           | 2.8 (7)              | 2.0 (3)                 | 2.4 (5)        | 5.1 (25)                          | 3.1(8.9)                      | 91.2              |
| Pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ ha PE + 1 HW | 1.7(2)               | 2.2 (4)           | 2.0 (3)              | 1.7 (2)                 | 2.2 (2)        | 4.0 (15)                          | 2.6 (6.0)                     | 94.1              |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ ha PE           | 4.4 (18)             | 2.6 (6)           | 4.6 (20)             | 4.0 (15)                | 3.0 (8)        | 8.2 (67)                          | 5.2 (25.8)                    | 74.6              |
| Isoproturon 0.75 kg/ ha PoE         | 4.4 (18)             | 2.0 (3)           | 3.9 (14)             | 3.9 (14)                | 2.6 (6)        | 7.5 (55)                          | 20.0 (20.0)                   | 83.7              |
| Isoproturon 0.75 kg/ ha PoE + 1 HW  | 4.8 (22)             | 3.0 (8)           | 4.9 (23)             | 4.6 (20)                | 2.8(7)         | 9.0 (80)                          | 5.4 (27.7)                    | 72.7              |
| 25% more seed                       | 6.1 (36)             | 5.2 (26)          | 5.7 (32)             | 4.7 (21)                | 3.0 (8)        | 11.1 (123)                        | 6.9 (46.3)                    | 45.4              |
| 25% more seed + 1 HW                | 5.6 (30)             | 3.9 (14)          | 4.7 (21)             | 3.2 (9)                 | 4.0 (15)       | 9.5 (89)                          | 4.8 (22.0)                    | 78.3              |
| One hand weeding                    | 5.3 (27)             | 3.5 (11)          | 5.2 (26)             | 4.9 (23)                | 2.6 (6)        | 9.7 (93)                          | 5.7 (31.1)                    | 69.4              |
| Weed free check                     | 1.0(1)               | 1.0(1)            | 1.4 (1)              | 1.0 (0)                 | 1.4 (1)        | 1.7 (2)                           | 1.5 (1.2)                     | 98.8              |
| Weedy check                         | 7.7 (59)             | 7.0 (48)          | 6.3 (39)             | 4.1 (16)                | 4.9 (23)       | 13.6 (185)                        | 10.1(101.5)                   | -                 |
| LSD (P=0.05)                        | 0.8                  | 0.9               | 0.7                  | 0.6                     | 0.6            | 1.3                               | 0.7                           | -                 |

Values given in parentheses are mean of original values, which are transformed to  $\sqrt{x+1}$ , DAS: Days after sowing; HW: Hand weeding; PE: Preemergence (just after sowing); PoE: Post-emergence

Table 2. Effect of weed control treatments on yield and economics of lentil (pooled data of two years)

| Treatment                        | Pods/<br>plant | Grains/<br>pod | 1000-seed<br>weight (g) | Seed<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Straw<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | HI<br>(%) | Gross return<br>(x 10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | Net return<br>(x 10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | B:C<br>ratio |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--|--|--------------|
| Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha PE       | 95.2           | 1.3            | 31.3                    | 1.59                    | 2.20                     | 0.42      | 22.34                                    | 15.14                                  | 2.1          |
| Pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha PE+1 HW | 96.2           | 1.4            | 31.3                    | 1.66                    | 2.29                     | 0.42      | 23.26                                    | 15.91                                  | 2.3          |
| Isoproturon 1.0 kg/ha PE         | 90.1           | 1.3            | 30.4                    | 1.50                    | 2.16                     | 0.41      | 21.07                                    | 14.57                                  | 2.2          |
| Isoproturon 0.75 kg/ha PoE       | 95.4           | 1.3            | 31.5                    | 1.55                    | 2.15                     | 0.42      | 21.81                                    | 15.13                                  | 2.2          |
| Isoproturon 0.75 kg/ha PoE+1 HW  | 88.9           | 1.3            | 31.2                    | 1.42                    | 2.04                     | 0.41      | 19.93                                    | 13.56                                  | 2.1          |
| 25% more seed                    | 69.5           | 1.2            | 29.3                    | 1.29                    | 2.28                     | 0.36      | 18.17                                    | 12.08                                  | 2.0          |
| 25% more seed + 1 HW             | 72.5           | 1.3            | 29.8                    | 1.54                    | 2.37                     | 0.39      | 21.67                                    | 15.04                                  | 2.3          |
| One hand weeding                 | 93.8           | 1.3            | 33.0                    | 1.48                    | 2.14                     | 0.41      | 20.84                                    | 14.49                                  | 2.2          |
| Weed-free                        | 94.2           | 1.5            | 33.8                    | 1.69                    | 2.54                     | 0.40      | 23.75                                    | 15.75                                  | 2.0          |
| Weedy check                      | 72.5           | 1.2            | 29.3                    | 1.05                    | 2.00                     | 0.34      | 14.79                                    | 8.79                                   | 1.5          |
| LSD (P=0.05)                     | 10.7           | 0.2            | 1.0                     | 0.21                    | 0.27                     | 0.02      | -  | -                                      | -            |

1). Lowest weed density (4 m<sup>2</sup>) and dry weight (2.64 g/m<sup>2</sup>) was recorded where pendimethalin was applied 0.75 kg/ha as PE plus one hand weeding, which was statistically at par with pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha PE and significantly lower than that of other treatments, involving isoproturon irrespective of dose, time or with or without hand weeding. Increased seed rate of 25% significantly decreased the weed dry weight (32%) in comparison to their respective treatments. The maximum weed control efficiency of 94.1% was recorded with pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha with one hand weeding followed by pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha this may be attributed to inhibition of weed seed germination. Similar findings were also reported by Singh *et al.* (1994) and Jain (2007).

## Effect on crop

Application of herbicides had significant effect on yields and yield attributes of lentil (Table 2). The highest grain yield of 1.66 t/ha was produced by pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha plus one hand weeding was statically at par with pendimethalin 1 kg/ha as well as weed free and proved superior over rest of the treatments with respect to grain yield. However, similar trends were observed for straw yield. Twenty five per cent increase in seed rate also significantly influenced the grain and straw yield as comparison to their respective treatments. On an average 22.8% increase in yield was recorded by 25% increase in seed rate, while 19.26 and 40.87% increment in yield was observed by one hand weeding in the treatment of 25% increased seed and normal seed rate conditions, respectively.

Weed-free conditions provided 60% increased in yield over weedy. Similar results were also reported by Jain (2007).

# Economics

Data presented in Table 2 revealed that the highest gross returns (₹ 23,268), net returns (₹ 15,918) and B:C was recorded with application of pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ ha PE + one hand weeding among different herbicidal treatments, while it was almost similar to the weed free conditions. Whereas lowest gross return and net return were recorded in weedy check. Similar findings were also reported by Turk and Tawaha (2001) and Jain (2007).

Therefore, it was concluded that pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha PE followed by one hand weeding is better for broad-spectrum weed control, including grassy as well as broad-leaved weeds.

- Jain VK. 2007. Integrated Weed Management in lentil (Lens culinaris Medik.). M.Sc. Ag. Thesis, Deptt. of Agronomy, S.V.P. University of Agriculture & Tech., Meerut (UP) India.
- Phogat SB, Kumar S, Sangwan N and Hooda RS. 2003. Effect of herbicides and cultural practices on weed flora of lentil. *Indian Journal of Pulses Research* **16**(2): 119-121.
- Singh G, Mehta RK and Singh OP. 1994. Weed control in lentil under rainfed low land conditions. *Indian Journal of Pulses Research* 7(2): 132-136.
- Turk MA and Tawaha AM. 2001. Effect of time and frequency of weeding on growth, yield and economics of chickpea and lentil. *Research on Crops* **2**(2): 103-107.

Indian Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 116–119, 2013

# Integration of chemical and cultural methods for weed management in groundnut

A.H. Kalhapure\*, B.T. Shete and P.S. Bodake

Breeder Seed Production Farm, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri, Maharashtra 413 722

Received: 2 March 2013; Revised: 4 May 2013

# ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted to study the integrated weed management in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) for consecutive two *Kharif* seasons in 2010 and 2011 at Rahuri with combination of 12 weed management treatments in three replications. Weed free check (two hand weeding at 20 and 40 DAS and manually uprooting of weeds at 60 DAS) was found more effective to control weeds in groundnut and recorded lowest weed density, wed dry matter and weed index and highest weed control efficiency. It was also recorded significantly highest growth and yield attributes in groundnut over all the other treatments *viz.* plant height, dry matter weight of plant, number of pods/plant and pod yield/hectare. Though highest gross monetary returns (₹ 1,09,845/ha) was recorded in the treatment application of pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as post-emergence + one hand weeding at 40 DAS which was found most economically feasible weed management practice for groundnut.

Key words: Cultural methods, Economics, Groundnut, Herbicides, Weed dynamics, Weed management, Yield

Groundnut is an important oilseed crop of India which is cultivated in nearly 6 million ha area with the production of 7.5 million tones and average productivity of 1.27 t/ha. Though India ranks first in the world under groundnut area, there is need to import 8.03 million tons of edible oil. The principle reasons behind this are lower productivity and losses of commodity at the time of various stages of crop production. Cultivation of groundnut as rain fed crop, lack of knowledge among the farmers about cultivation of groundnut with modern technology, unawareness of improved varieties and improper fertilization etc. are some causes of lower productivity of groundnut in India. Along with these, the major cause of minimizing production is severe weed infestation in crop. In India, yield losses of groundnut due to weeds ranged from 13-80% (Ghosh et al. 2000).

Weeding and hoeing are common cultural and manual weed management methods for groundnut, but with considering the scarcity of labours, these methods are very costly and tedious. Mechanically operated power weeder can not be used after peg initiation of groundnut. On the other hand, use of herbicides is also limited due to their selectivity. Hence the agronomic investigation was conducted to find out practically convenient and economically feasible combination of chemical and cultural methods of weed management in groundnut.

#### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The experiment was conducted at Breeder Seed Production Farm of Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri for two consecutive *Kharif* seasons of the years 2010 and 2011 in randomized block design with 12 treatments replicated thrice. The experimental site was located at 19<sup>0</sup> 47' N latitudes and 74<sup>0</sup> 81' E longitudes with average annual rainfall of 520 mm. The soil of experimental field was medium deep with pH 6.2, available N 380 kg/ha, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>14.5 kg/ha and K<sub>2</sub>O 275 kg/ha. The treatments consisted of combination of hand weeding with pre-plant incorporation of fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha, pre-emergence application of pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (Table 1).

Groundnut variety '*TAG*- 24' was sown in first fortnight of July during both the experimental years with plant spacing of 45 x 15 cm<sup>2</sup> on flat beds. The recommended dose of fertilizer 25 : 50 : 00 kg/ha N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O was applied as half of N and full P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O at the time of sowing and remaining N was applied one month after sowing the crop. Protective irrigations were applied whenever it was necessary during the crop growth. Fluchloralin was applied one day before sowing as pre-plant incorporation in soil and pendimethalin was applied one day after sowing as pre-emergence, whereas imazethapyr was applied 20 days after sowing as post-emergence as per the treatment details (Table 1) with knapsack sprayer. Weed free

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: aniketmpkv@gmail.com

check was achieved by two hand weedings at 20 and 40 DAS and manual uprooting of weeds at 60 DAS. Randomly five plants were selected from each plot and regular biometric observations of crop and weed parameters were recorded from 30 DAS up to harvest. However, observation data recorded at the peck growth period of crop *i.e.* 90 DAS is given in tables for study the results and discussion. Weed density (no./m<sup>2</sup>) and dry weight of weeds (g/m<sup>2</sup>) were recorded by putting a quadrate of  $0.25m^2$  at two random spots in each plot. Weed control efficiency and weed index was calculated by standard formulae. For economic study, prevailing market price was used for different outputs and inputs.

# **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

# Effect on weeds

Predominant weeds in experimental groundnut field were: Parthenium hysterophorus, Amaranthus viridis, Portulaca oleracea, Argemone mexicana, Euphorbia spp., Solanum nigrum, Echinochloa colonum, Cyperus rotundus and Cynodon dactylon.

All the treatments were responsible for significant reduction in weed density and dry weight of weeds over control. Treatment of weed free check resulted in lowest weed density and dry weight of weeds. However, treatment weed free check, pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE+ one hand weeding at

40 DAS and fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha as PPI + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE + one hand weeding at 40 DAS were found to be at par with each other in respect of these weed parameters.

Highest weed control efficiency and lowest weed index percentage were observed in weed free check. Pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE + one hand weeding at 40 DAS was found next superior treatment after weed free check in respect of all weed parameters. This might be due to pre-plant soil incorporation of fluchloralin and pre-emergence application of pendimethalin which prevented emergence of monocot and grassy weeds by inhibiting root and shoot growth, while imazethapyr was responsible for inhibition of acetolactate synthase (ALS) or acetohydroxyacid synthase (AHAS) in broad-leaved weeds which caused destruction of these weeds at 3-4 leaf stage. Remaining monocot weeds were controlled by hand weeding at 40 DAS and manual uprooting at 60 DAS. Lowest weed control efficiency and highest weed index percentage were recorded in weedy check (control). Integration of hand weeding with preand post-emergence herbicides resulted significant reduction in dry matter production by weeds (Walia et al. 2007). Dubey and Gangwar (2012) have also found lower weed biomass, weed index and higher weed control efficiency with post-emergence application of imazethapyr and two hand weeding in groundnut.

 Table 1. Effect of different weed management practices on weed parameters in groundnut at 90 DAS (pooled mean)

| Treatment   | Weed density<br>(no./m <sup>2</sup> ) | Weed control<br>efficiency (%) | Weed index<br>(%) |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha as PPI + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE                              | 37.88                                 | 74.60                          | 43.93             |
| Imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE + one hand weeding at 40 DAS                                 | 26.62                                 | 87.44                          | 26.98             |
| Pendimethalin 1.5 kg /ha as PE  | 47.94                                 | 67.94                          | 61.78             |
| Fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha as PPI + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE + one hand weeding at 40 DAS | 22.19                                 | 87.83                          | 18.26             |
| Imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE  | 41.54                                 | 69.31                          | 54.52             |
| Fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha as PPI + one hand weeding at 20 DAS                                  | 31.34                                 | 78.71                          | 38.22             |
| Pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ ha as PE+ imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE+ one hand weeding at 40 DAS  | 19.54                                 | 89.94                          | 5.13              |
| Pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE+ one hand weeding at 20 DAS                                   | 30.71                                 | 82.53                          | 35.37             |
| Fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha as PPI   | 50.28                                 | 65.66                          | 57.91             |
| Pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE+ imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE                               | 36.29                                 | 73.82                          | 41.97             |
| Weed-free   | 16.66                                 | 91.40                          | 0.00              |
| Weedy check   | 124.39                                | 0.00                           | 69.52             |
| LSD (P=0.05)  | 7.63                                  | -                              | -                 |

PPI- Pre-plant incorporation; PE- Pre-emergence; POE- Post-emergence

#### Effect on crop

Weed-free recorded significantly taller plants and higher dry matter production and pod yield/hectare over all the other treatments. This was followed by treatment pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE + one hand weeding at 40 DAS. However in respect of number of pods/plant, weed free check and pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE + one hand weeding at 40 DAS were found at par with each other. This might be due to minimizing the competition of weeds with main crop for resources viz. space, light, nutrients and moisture with adaption of effective weed control methods. Singh and Giri (2001) has also concluded that proper weed control was responsible for increase in plant height and dry matter production in groundnut. Weed free environment in crop also facilitated better peg initiation and development at the critical growth stages of groundnut which tends to increase in number of pods/plant and pod yield/hectare. Higher profitable pod yield of summer groundnut was also reported by Raj et al. (2008) with keeping the crop in weed free condition. Significantly lower values of plant height, number of pods and pod yield were recorded in treatment weedy check.

Number of kernels/pod was recorded highest in weed free check, but there was no significant effect of weed management practices on number of kernels per pod in groundnut.

#### **Economics**

Weed-free check recorded significantly highest gross returns, which was ₹ 1,09,845/ha, whereas highest net returns (₹ 61,460) and B:C ratio (2.42) were recorded in treatment pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE+ one hand weeding at 40 DAS. This might be due to the cost of cultivation of groundnut crop was increased in treatment weed free check due to the higher need of human labours and their higher wages. This cost was reduced in treatment pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE+ one hand weeding at 40 DAS by using herbicides to effective control of weeds with minimizing human labours. Sasikala et. al. (2004) and Rao et. al. (2011) have also reported higher net return and B:C ratio with integration of pre- and postemergence application of herbicides with hand weeding in groundnut. Weedy check (control) recorded lowest gross monetary return (₹ 33,660/ha), net monetary return (₹ 2,140/ha) and B:C ratio (0.94).

 Table 2. Effect of different weed management practices on growth, yield and economics of groundnut (pooled mean)

| Treatment  | Plant<br>height at<br>90 DAS<br>(cm) | No. of<br>pods/plant | No. of<br>kernels/pod | Pod<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Gross returns<br>(x 10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | Net returns<br>(x 10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | B:C<br>ratio |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---|---|--------------|
| Fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ ha as PPI+<br>imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ ha as POE                               | 22.27                                | 16.8                 | 2.19                  | 1.38                   | 61.92                                     | 22.66                                   | 1.58         |
| Imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE+ one<br>hand weeding at 40 DAS                                    | 25.18                                | 19.5                 | 2.34                  | 1.79                   | 80.64                                     | 38.84                                   | 1.93         |
| Pendimethalin 1.5 kg /ha as PE   | 21.61                                | 14.8                 | 2.27                  | 0.94                   | 42.21                                     | 4.91                                    | 1.13         |
| Fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha as PPI+<br>imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE +<br>one hand weeding at 40 DAS | 25.37                                | 19.5                 | 2.34                  | 2.01                   | 90.27                                     | 46.97                                   | 2.08         |
| Imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE   | 22.03                                | 16.3                 | 2.19                  | 1.12                   | 50.22                                     | 12.42                                   | 1.32         |
| Fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha as PPI + one hand<br>weeding at 20 DAS                                    | 24.21                                | 17.3                 | 2.34                  | 1.52                   | 68.22                                     | 26.92                                   | 1.65         |
| Pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ ha as PE+<br>imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE+<br>one hand weeding at 40 DAS | 26.49                                | 21.2                 | 2.36                  | 2.33                   | 104.76                                    | 61.46                                   | 2.42         |
| Pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE+ one<br>hand weeding at 20 DAS                                     | 24.9                                 | 18.3                 | 2.26                  | 1.58                   | 71.14                                     | 29.84                                   | 1.72         |
| Fluchloralin 1.5 kg/ha as PPI  | 20.06                                | 14.7                 | 2.26                  | 1.03                   | 46.48                                     | 9.18                                    | 1.25         |
| Pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE+<br>imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE                                 | 22.46                                | 17.3                 | 2.24                  | 1.42                   | 64.08                                     | 24.78                                   | 1.63         |
| Weed-free  | 29.12                                | 22.0                 | 2.41                  | 2.45                   | 109.84                                    | 60.04                                   | 2.21         |
| Weedy check  | 16.84                                | 11.2                 | 2.17                  | 0.75                   | 33.66                                     | -2.14                                   | 0.94         |
| LSD (P=0.05)   | 2.01                                 | 1.6                  | NS                    | 0.12                   | 3.33                                      | 2.90                                    | -            |

Treatment pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha as PE + imazethapyr 0.150 kg/ha as POE + one hand weeding at 40 DAS proved practically more convenient and economically best feasible integrated weed management practice for groundnut. Considering the present condition of scarcity and high cost of labours, quality of weed control, yield and B:C ratio of cultivation of groundnut,

## REFERENCES

- Dubey Megha and Gangwar Suchi. 2012. Effect of chemical weed control of imazethapyr (Pursuit) in groundnut var. '*TG- 24*'. *Plant Archives* **12**(2): 675- 677.
- Ghosh PK, Mandal KG and Kuntal MH. 2000. Allelopathic effects of weeds on groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*) in India A review. *Agricultural Reviews* **21**(1): 66-69.
- Raj VC, Damame HS, Patel AM and Arvadia MK. 2008. Integrated weed management in summer groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*

L.), p.127. In: *Biennial Conference on Weed Management in Modern Agriculture: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities*, at Patna, Bihar during 27-28 February 2008.

- Rao SS, Madhavi M and Reddy CR. 2011. Integrated approach for weed control in *Rabi* groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Journal* of *Research ANGRAU* **39**(1): 60-63.
- Sasikala B, Reddy Y and Raghava Reddy C. 2004. Pre- and postemergence herbicides on weed control and yield of groundnut (Arachis hypogaea). Indian Journal of Dryland Agriculture Research and Development **19**(1): 78-80.
- Singh VB and Giri G. 2001. Influence of intercropping and weed control measures on dry matter accumulation and nutrient uptake by sunflower and groundnut and their effect on succeeding maize. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **46** (1): 50-55.
- Walia US, Surjit Singh and Buta Singh 2007. Integrated approach for the control of hardy weeds in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 39(1&2): 112-115.

, Indian Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 120–125, 2013

# Yield and quality analysis of spring–planted sugarcane as influenced by nutrient and weed management

Sandeep Kumar, Vachin Kumar, Avesh Kumar, Sanjay Kumar\* and Naresh Kumar Chaudhary Chhotu Ram Post-Graduate College, Muzaffarnagar, Uttar Pradesh 251 001

Received: 14 March 2013; Revised: 3 June 2013

#### ABSTRACT

A field study was conducted during spring season in 2007-08 and 2008-09 at Muzaffarnagar to evaluate the influence of nutrient and weed management practices on yield attributes, yield, quality, nutrient uptake and economics of sugarcane. Results showed that application of 125% of recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF) enhanced the cane yield to the tune of 15.52 and 3.60% over 75 and 100% RDF owing to remarkable improvement in cane length, cane girth, cane weight and NMC. Sucrose, available sugar and commercial cane sugar (CCS) yield were also improved by 17.3, 23.4 and 42.6% over 75% RDF while 2.73, 3.15 and 6.84% over 100% RDF, respectively under application of 25% higher RDF. The values of juice extraction and purity per cent were remained statistically unchanged under 100 and 125% RDF but significantly improved over 75% RDF. The uptake of NPK in cane, green tops, trash as well as in total produce along with net return and B:C ratio were also noticed higher under fertility enrichment with 125% in comparison to lower ones. Weed free treatment produced maximum values of cane and CCS yield, yield components, juice extraction and nutrient uptake which was followed by application of glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 days after planting followed by one hand weeding at 60 DAP and performing of three hand weeding at intervals of 30, 60 and 90 days after planting (DAP). Although, the higher B:C ratio was registered under application of glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha, at 25 DAP followed by one hand weeding at 60 DAP owing to lower cost of cultivation. Consequently, application of 125% recommended dose of N:  $P_2O_5$ :  $K_2O$  along with glyphosate applied 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP followed by one hand weeding at 60 DAP proved valuable in enhancing the yield, quality and economics of spring planted sugarcane.

Key words: Nutrient levels, Quality, Sugarcane, Weed management, Yield

Sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum* L.) is grown extensively in tropical and sub- tropical regions of India as cash crop and plays a pivotal role in both agricultural and industrial economy of the country. In India, sugarcane is grown under different agro-climatic conditions and occupies about 2.54% (5.08 mha) of gross cropped area with an average productivity of 68.4 t/ha. Sugarcane production coupled with improved quality traits needs sufficient amount of plant nutrients in the soil. Imbalanced and inadequate use of plant nutrients results in poor cane yield and emergence of multiple nutrient deficiencies.

Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium account for bulk of essential nutrients, which many soils are deficient and need supplementation through organic and inorganic sources. Higher fertilizer doses proved to be superior in respect to growth and yield. Thus, to make the sugarcane cultivation more remunerative, there is need to refine NPK recommendation upto the desired level. Due to slow germination and initial growth, wide row spacing, slow lateral spread, adequate supply of nutrients and moisture, long duration and diversity in weed population, sugarcane generally suffers from the tremendous weed problems. Uncontrolled weeds may cause 12 - 72% cane yield reduction. It is well established fact that a mechanical method of weed management is most effective to control weeds. However, higher cost involvement and lack of labour availability in proper time make it difficult to adopt by the farmers. On the other hand, only application of herbicide is not proved so effective method. Similarly, alternative herbicides should be tested to minimize the chances of weed resurgence against commonly used herbicides having same mode of action. Therefore, there is need to develop the most effective and economical fertilizer management and weed control practices for obtaining maximum yield as well as profitability. Keeping in view, a field experiment was conducted to recommend the best suitable fertilizer management and weed management technique for spring planted sugarcane crop.

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: sankumar91@rediffmail.com

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

An investigation was carried out during spring seasons of 2007-08 and 2008-09 at Agricultural Research farm of Chaudhary Chhotu Ram (P.G.) College, Muzaffarnagar (Uttar Pradesh) geographically situated at  $28.0^{\circ}$ N latitude and  $77.0^{\circ}$ E longitude at an altitude of 245.82 meters above the mean sea level. The soil of the experimental field was sandy- loam of Indo-Gangetic alluvial origin, very deep (>2m), well drained, flat and classified as non-calcareous mixed hyperthermic *Udic Ustochrept*, having pH 7.5 and was low in organic carbon (0.48%), medium in both available phosphorus (14.24 kg/ha), potassium (203.92 kg/ha) and low in available nitrogen (155.45 kg/ha) contents.

The experiment was laid out in a factorial randomized block design. The treatments consisted of total 21 combinations of three levels of NPK and seven weed control measures with three replications. The NPK levels were the application of 75% N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O (F<sub>1</sub>), 100% (150 :60 : 60 kg/ha) N:  $P_2O_5$ :  $K_2O_7(F_2)$  and 125% N:  $P_2O_5$ :  $K_2O_7(F_3)$ of the recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF). Under weed control measures, the treatments were: three hand weedings at 30, 60 and 90 DAP  $(W_1)$ , one hand weeding at 30 DAP followed by post emergence spray of atrazine  $2.0 \text{ kg/ha} (W_2)$ , atrazine 2.0 kg/ha as pre-emergence + 2, 4-D 1.0 kg/ha at 60 DAP (W<sub>3</sub>), glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP (W<sub>4</sub>) and Sesbania sesbane L. (Dhaincha) sowing in inter space followed by 2,4-D spray 1.0 kg/ha at 45 DAP ( $W_5$ ), weedy check ( $W_7$ ), weed free  $(W_6)$ .

Urea, diammonium phosphate and muriate of potash were taken as fertilizer sources for N, P and K, respectively. The amount of fertilizers and herbicides were calculated on the basis of gross plot area. Full dose of P and K and half dose of N were applied as basal. Remaining half N was top dressed in two equal splits after first irrigation and at the time of earthing up. All the herbicides were applied with the help of manually operated knapsack sprayer fitted with flat fan nozzle using a volume spray of 600 litres water/ha.

A mid-late variety of sugarcane '*CoS*-97264' was planted on 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> March of 2007 and 2008, respectively on leveled soil by opening 15 cm deep furrow at 75 cm row spacing. During 2008-09, the experiment was conducted in the adjacent to the experimental plot of 2007-08. All the recommended agronomic practices were followed throughout the cropping period. The crop was harvested on 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> February 2008 and 2009, respectively.

Whole cane samples were taken at the time of harvest and analyzed for quality parameters through standard laboratory procedures. The economics of experiment was worked out on the basis of cost of cultivation and cane yield at prevailing market prices of the treatments. The uptake of N, P and K by sugarcane plant was calculated by multiplying the concentration with their respective dry matter yield (kg/ha). The per cent available sugar was calculated as; available sugar (%) = {S – (B – S) x 0.4 x 0.73}, where S and B are sucrose and brix per cent in cane juice, respectively. The trend of results was similar during both the years hence, data were subjected to pooled analysis for results and discussion.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Yield attributes

NPK levels had significant impact on yield attributes (Table 1). Among the different fertility levels of NPK, the application of 125% ( $F_3$ ) of the recommended dose of NPK was superior to all other fertility levels in terms of cane length, cane girth, number of internodes/cane, single cane weight as well as number of millable canes (NMC). It was followed by NPK application at 100% ( $F_2$ ) recommended dose except in case of cane girth where both the treatments yielded statistically similar response. The lowest yield attributes of sugarcane was obtained from the plots receiving 75% ( $F_1$ ) recommended dose of NPK.

The increase in yield components under higher dose of fertility might be ascribed to better nutritional environment for plant growth at active vegetative stages as a result of improvement in root growth, cell multiplication and elongation in the plant body, which ultimately increased the cane length. The maximum cane girth, number of internodes/cane, individual cane weight and number of millable canes with highest level of NPK was primarily due to the improved fertility status of soil which created congenial environment for better growth and development of sugarcane plant. The positive response with NPK on yield attributes of sugarcane was also reported by Shukla (2007).

Weed management modules under investigation also significantly influenced the yield components of sugarcane (Table 1). Weed free plots ( $W_6$ ) produced maximum values of yield attributes, *viz.* cane length, cane girth, single cane weight, number of internodes/ plant and NMC being at par with application of glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP ( $W_4$ ) and performing of three hand weeding at 30, 60 and 90 DAP ( $W_1$ ). The latter two treatments ( $W_1$  and  $W_4$ ) were also tended the similar response except in generation of NMC where  $W_4$  showed superiority over  $W_3$  The lowest values of yield parameters were observed under control *i.e.* weedy check ( $W_7$ ) treatment.

Sugarcane raised with weed free (W<sub>6</sub>), application of glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP (W<sub>4</sub>) and three hand weeding at 30, 60 and 90 DAP (W<sub>1</sub>) produced highest yield components by virtue of reduced competition of weeds for nutrient, moisture and sunlight. These results are in agreement with the findings of Srivastava and Chauhan (2006).

# Yield

Fertility levels brought significant variations among cane, green tops and trash yields (Table 1). Significantly higher commercial cane sugar (CCS) and cane, green tops as well as trash yields were obtained with 125% ( $F_3$ ) recommended dose of NPK. However, fertilization of cane crop with being 100% RDF produced equal green top and trash yields as obtained with 125% recommended dose of NPK as compared to 75% ( $F_1$ ) recommended dose of NPK. The increase in yield under higher doses of fertilizer might be due to enhanced cane growth and development attributed to the production of lengthiest, thickest and heaviest canes. The increased rate of cane growth coupled with better expression of yield components might have attributed for enhancing the cane yield under higher fertility. Saini *et.al.* (2007) and Naidu *et.al.* (2008) reported increase in cane yield with corresponding increase in levels of fertilizer.

The highest cane, green tops and trash yields were obtained under weed free conditions ( $W_6$ ) which was found on par with the application of glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP ( $W_4$ ). It was followed by adoption of weed management schedule  $W_1$ , in which three hand hoeing were performed at interval of 30, 60 and 90 DAP. While the lowest values of yields of cane, green tops and trash were noticed by un-weeded plots ( $W_7$ ).

The increase in cane, green tops and trash yields with these treatments was because of the fact that the weed population and weed growth remained low under their initial crop growth period as compared to weedy check. The reduced crop-weed competition provided proper development of growth characters which enhanced the yield attributes, *viz.* cane length, cane diameter , number of internodes/cane, cane weight and NMC/ha which led to higher cane, green top and trash yield. A negative correlation between most of the growth, yield attributes and dry matter of weeds at final harvest has also been established by the earlier researchers. This finding was in conformity with Singh and Menhi (2008).

 Table 1. Effect of fertilizer and weed management on yield components and yield of spring-planted sugarcane (pooled data of two cycles)

|                   | Cane length | Cane          | Number of           | Single cane | NMC*                    | Y     | Yield (t/ha)  |       |  |  |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------|---------------|-------|--|--|
| Treatment         | (cm)        | girth<br>(cm) | internodes/<br>cane | weight (g)  | (x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | Cane  | Green<br>tops | Trash |  |  |
| Fertilizer levels |             |               |                     |             |                         |       |               |       |  |  |
| $F_1$             | 247.7       | 6.35          | 20.30               | 709.2       | 90.0                    | 76.20 | 15.29         | 7.94  |  |  |
| $F_2$             | 265.2       | 7.00          | 23.33               | 798.7       | 108.0                   | 84.97 | 17.40         | 8.79  |  |  |
| F <sub>3</sub>    | 277.4       | 6.96          | 23.82               | 818.4       | 110.1                   | 88.03 | 17.64         | 9.03  |  |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)      | 4.8         | 0.17          | 0.24                | 12.1        | 2.3                     | 3.24  | 0.66          | 0.37  |  |  |
| Weed control      |             |               |                     |             |                         |       |               |       |  |  |
| $\mathbf{W}_1$    | 269.8       | 7.03          | 23.25               | 802.8       | 112.1                   | 89.55 | 17.99         | 9.24  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{W}_2$    | 262.5       | 6.65          | 22.20               | 778.6       | 103.6                   | 84.18 | 16.68         | 8.51  |  |  |
| $W_3$             | 253.7       | 6.50          | 21.75               | 757.7       | 88.8                    | 78.61 | 16.38         | 7.97  |  |  |
| $W_4$             | 276.1       | 7.15          | 23.46               | 818.7       | 117.4                   | 90.08 | 18.45         | 9.32  |  |  |
| $W_5$             | 257.2       | 6.33          | 22.62               | 780.7       | 93.1                    | 81.41 | 16.73         | 8.31  |  |  |
| $W_6$             | 283.4       | 7.24          | 23.88               | 826.3       | 127.4                   | 97.50 | 18.93         | 9.67  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{W}_7$    | 241.3       | 5.85          | 20.25               | 663.1       | 76.4                    | 60.13 | 12.25         | 7.10  |  |  |
| LSD(P=0.05)       | 13.9        | 0.25          | 1.02                | 40.7        | 5.2                     | 4.65  | 0.85          | 0.44  |  |  |

#Details of treatments are given in Materials and Methods; \*Number of millable canes

## Juice quality

Fertility levels caused significant impact on juice quality parameters except brix percentage which nullify the effect of fertility levels (Table 2). The juice quality and CCS yield were improved with each successive increase in NPK levels. The crop fertilized with NPK at 125% ( $F_1$ ) of recommended dose significantly boost the sucrose and available sugar % and CCS yield but was reported on par in terms of juice extraction % and purity % with the application of 100% RDF. The lower values of these parameters were recorded under lowest fertility treatments. The remarkable improvement in CCS under high fertility conditions in comparison to sub fertility conditions was due to production of higher cane yield coupled with enhanced juice quality parameters.

The probable cause of improvement in juice quality parameters on account of 125% of RDF might be that N, P and K are the integral part of various sucrose metabolizing enzymes which are involved in sucrose synthesis and its accumulation in sugarcane. The improvement

| Table 2. Effect of fertilizer and weed management on juice quality and commercial cane sugar (CCS) yield of |
|---|
| spring-planted sugarcane (pooled data of two cycles)  |

| Treatment             | Juice extraction<br>(%) | Brix<br>(%) | Sucrose (%) | Purity<br>coefficient<br>(%) | Available<br>sugar<br>(%) | CCS yield<br>(t/ha) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Fertilizer levels     |                         |             |             |                              |                           |                     |
| $F_1$                 | 48.00                   | 18.71       | 13.43       | 72.43                        | 11.94                     | 9.09                |
| $F_2$                 | 51.61                   | 18.95       | 15.33       | 80.89                        | 14.28                     | 12.13               |
| $F_3$                 | 52.32                   | 19.10       | 15.75       | 81.73                        | 14.73                     | 12.96               |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | 1.11                    | NS          | 0.36        | 1.84                         | 0.18                      | 0.33                |
| Weed control          |                         |             |             |                              |                           |                     |
| $\mathbf{W}_1$        | 51.63                   | 19.08       | 15.15       | 79.40                        | 14.01                     | 12.54               |
| $W_2$                 | 50.41                   | 18.85       | 14.61       | 77.50                        | 13.38                     | 11.26               |
| $W_3$                 | 49.15                   | 18.82       | 14.43       | 76.67                        | 13.15                     | 10.33               |
| $W_4$                 | 52.48                   | 18.90       | 15.08       | 79.78                        | 13.97                     | 12.58               |
| W5                    | 50.05                   | 18.63       | 14.76       | 79.22                        | 13.63                     | 11.09               |
| $W_6$                 | 53.00                   | 19.36       | 15.18       | 78.40                        | 13.96                     | 13.61               |
| <b>W</b> <sub>7</sub> | 47.75                   | 18.80       | 14.63       | 77.81                        | 13.42                     | 8.06                |
| LSD(P=0.05)           | 2.56                    | NS          | NS          | NS                           | NS                        | 0.53                |

#Details of treatments are given in Materials and Methods

 Table 3. Effect of fertilizer and weed management on nutrient uptake (kg/ha) of sugarcane (pooled data of two cycles)

|                   | Ν      | uptake (kg    | g/ha) |        | Р     | uptake (k     | kg/ha) |       | K uptake (kg/ha) |               |       |        |
|-------------------|--------|---------------|-------|--------|-------|---------------|--------|-------|------------------|---------------|-------|--------|
| Treatment         | Cane   | Green<br>tops | Trash | Total  | Cane  | Green<br>tops | Trash  | Total | Cane             | Green<br>tops | Trash | Total  |
| Fertilizer levels |        |               |       |        |       |               |        |       |                  |               |       |        |
| $F_1$             | 79.10  | 35.94         | 16.19 | 131.23 | 23.71 | 7.33          | 4.17   | 35.21 | 142.24           | 72.92         | 24.05 | 239.19 |
| F <sub>2</sub>    | 105.71 | 52.15         | 23.86 | 181.72 | 30.05 | 9.45          | 5.34   | 44.84 | 166.01           | 78.71         | 27.99 | 273.72 |
| F3                | 110.10 | 53.76         | 24.24 | 188.10 | 31.02 | 9.91          | 5.52   | 46.45 | 166.9            | 80.20         | 28.89 | 275.99 |
| LSD (P=0.05)      | 2.05   | 1.15          | 0.38  | 3.43   | 0.59  | 0.30          | 0.12   | 1.38  | 5.36             | 3.35          | 0.40  | 8.52   |
| Weed control      |        |               |       |        |       |               |        |       |                  |               |       |        |
| $W_1$             | 106.21 | 52.21         | 23.90 | 182.32 | 30.37 | 9.64          | 5.41   | 45.42 | 163.90           | 84.91         | 28.95 | 277.75 |
| $W_2$             | 94.93  | 47.76         | 20.95 | 163.64 | 27.88 | 8.94          | 4.76   | 41.58 | 156.24           | 77.61         | 27.99 | 261.83 |
| $W_3$             | 86.64  | 41.96         | 18.53 | 147.13 | 23.70 | 7.70          | 4.25   | 35.65 | 144.48           | 72.90         | 24.59 | 176.39 |
| $W_4$             | 111.70 | 55.30         | 24.99 | 191.99 | 32.22 | 10.47         | 6.25   | 48.94 | 168.85           | 85.91         | 30.04 | 207.48 |
| $W_5$             | 97.17  | 45.04         | 20.76 | 162.97 | 26.58 | 8.18          | 4.94   | 39.70 | 154.01           | 74.90         | 25.01 | 253.92 |
| $W_6$             | 120.22 | 57.98         | 25.95 | 204.15 | 35.61 | 11.32         | 6.52   | 53.44 | 182.00           | 87.93         | 31.09 | 301.02 |
| $W_7$             | 71.22  | 30.78         | 14.91 | 116.91 | 21.50 | 6.04          | 2.94   | 30.43 | 129.39           | 60.50         | 21.05 | 210.94 |
| LSD(P=0.05)       | 4.91   | 2.62          | 1.20  | 8.35   | 1.54  | 0.45          | 0.28   | 2.11  | 6.30             | 4.21          | 0.73  | 11.90  |

in purity percent might have been attributed to higher phosphorus content in cane that help in better flocculation of non-sugar colloids during purification process and results in minimum turbidity of clarified juice. The beneficial effect of NPK fertilization on the juice quality has also been reported by Singh *et al.* (2008).

Weed management options did not result in significant variations with respect to brix, sucrose, purity and available sugar % except juice extraction and CCS yield (Table 2). Nevertheless, performing three hoeing at intervals of 30, 60 and 90 DAP ( $W_1$ ) numerically improved the sucrose, purity and available sugar % values.

The highest juice extraction% and CCS yield were recorded from the weed free plots ( $W_6$ ) which were found at par with glyphosphate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP ( $W_4$ ) and followed by adoption of three hoeing at intervals of 30, 60 and 90 DAP ( $W_1$ ) in case of juice extraction, while no perceivable difference was observed in generation of CCS yield under the treatments application of glyphosphate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP ( $W_4$ ) and three hoeing did at intervals of 30, 60 and 90 DAP ( $W_4$ ). The lowest values of juice recovery and CCS yield (t/ha) was registered under control plots ( $W_7$ ).

Available sugar is dependent on brix %, sucrose % and purity% of cane juice, which showed non-significant variation under different weed management practices. Non-significant variations in brix, sucrose, reducing sugar and available sugar has also been reported by Singh and Menhi (2008). The highest CCS yield obtained with weed free situations was owing to maximum cane yield and juice recovery % along with numerically improved values of juice quality parameters.

# Nutrient uptake

NPK uptake by cane, green top, trash and total uptake differed significantly with varying fertility levels (Table 3). The maximum uptake of NPK in cane as well as in green tops, trash and total was recorded at 125% RDF followed by 100% RDF. The lowest NPK uptake by different sugarcane plant parts (cane, green tops, trash and total) was found under 75% RDF of NPK. The uptake of NPK under 125% RDF was increased to the tune of 43.34, 31.92 and 35.67, respectively over 75% RDF. The higher values of NPK uptake by sugarcane plant parts, *viz.* cane, green top and trash under increased fertility levels was mainly due to increased concentration of these nutrients in root zone followed by better expression of growth and yield attributes. Venkatakrishnan and Ravichandran (2007) also corroborated the similar findings. All the weed control treatments significantly increased the NPK status in various plant parts of sugarcane over weedy check (Table 3). The highest uptake of NPK was noticed in crop with weed free plots ( $W_6$ ) which was followed by glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP and three hand weeding carried out at 30, 60 and 90 DAP ( $W_1$ ). The per cent increase in NPK uptake under weed free ( $W_6$ ) treatment was to the tune of 74.62, 75.62 and 45.37, respectively over weedy check.

The maximum uptake of NPK by different sugarcane plant parts under weed free, glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP and three hand weeding at 30, 60 and 90 DAP were due to the suppression of weed growth which might have been the deriving force behind higher dry matter accumulation and nutrient uptake in sugarcane under these treatments. A similar result was also reported by Singh *et al.* 

# Economics

The highest gross and net return and B:C ratio were recorded when the crop was fertilized with 125% RDF and these values recorded lowest in the crop grown under 75% RDF (Table 4). The second best treatment was 100% RDF, which fetched a gross return of Rs 11,8212/ha, net return of Rs 82,786/ha with B: C ratio of 2.33. The superiority of 125% RDF over other fertility levels in terms of gross, net returns and B : C ratio was primarily due to production of highest cane yield.

The maximum gross and net returns were recorded under weed free plots ( $W_6$ ) followed by application of glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP ( $W_4$ ), whereas the lowest values of gross, net re-

# Table 4. Economic analysis of spring-planted sugar-<br/>cane as influenced by fertilizer and weed<br/>management (pooled data of two cycles)

| Treatment      | Cost of<br>cultivation<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | Gross<br>returns<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | Net returns (x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | B : C<br>ratio |
|----------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| Fertilizer lev | els   |   |                                     |                |
| $\mathbf{F}_1$ | 34.05   | 106.89                                      | 72.85                               | 2.14           |
| $F_2$          | 35.43   | 118.21                                      | 82.79                               | 2.33           |
| F3             | 36.64   | 123.38                                      | 86.74                               | 2.36           |
| Weed control   | !   |   |                                     |                |
| $\mathbf{W}_1$ | 37.12   | 125.52                                      | 88.40                               | 2.38           |
| $\mathbf{W}_2$ | 35.19   | 117.73                                      | 82.54                               | 2.34           |
| $W_3$          | 33.78   | 110.56                                      | 76.78                               | 2.27           |
| $\mathbf{W}_4$ | 35.07   | 126.54                                      | 91.47                               | 2.61           |
| $W_5$          | 35.65   | 114.35                                      | 78.71                               | 2.21           |
| $W_6$          | 39.00   | 135.98                                      | 96.98                               | 2.48           |
| $W_7$          | 31.77   | 84.96                                       | 53.08                               | 1.67           |

turns and B : C ratio were observed under weedy check plots ( $W_7$ ). While the higher B :C ratio was noticed under the glyphosphate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weed-ing at 60 DAP ( $W_4$ ) treatment over weed-free treatment ( $W_6$ ) was registered owing to lower cost of cultivation. The lowest of gross, net returns and B : C ratio under the weedy check treatment was due to production of lowered cane yield.

From the present study, it can be ascertained that application of 125% RDF (187.5: 75; 75, N:P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>:K<sub>2</sub>O kg/ha) along with post-emergence spray of glyphosate 1.0 kg/ha at 25 DAP + one hand weeding at 60 DAP were the best options for realizing higher productivity, juice quality, net returns and B :C ratio of spring planted sugarcane in Indo-Gangetic plains of Uttar Pradesh.

#### REFERENCES

- Naidu NV, Devi TC, Rajeshwari VR and Rosaiah. 2008. Technologies to increase cane productivity under rainfed conditions. *Cooperative Sugar* **39**(9): 23-30.
- Saini SK, Tyagi S and Singh D. 2007. Effect of integrated nutrient management on soil fertility and productivity in sugarcane and

its ratoon in sugarcane based cropping system: an economic study. *Cooperative Sugar* **38**(5): 57-62.

- Shukla SK. 2007. Productivity and economics of high sugar genotypes of sugarcane in plant-ration system under various planting seasons and fertility levels. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* 52(2): 164-167.
- Singh AK and Menhi Lal. 2008. Weed management in spring-planted sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp. hybrid)-based intercropping systems. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 78(1): 35-39.
- Singh H, Navneet Kumar and Singh VP. 2008. Response of sugarcane varieties to fertility levels under rainfed condition. *Rajendra Agricultural University Journal of Research* **18**(1-2): 34-36.
- Singh Rohitashav, Radhey Shyam and Sanjay Kumar. 2009. Integrated weed management studies on sugarcane ratoon. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **41**(3&4): 195-197.
- Srivastava TK and Chauhan RS. 2006. Weed dynamics and control of weeds in relation to management practices under sugarcane (*Saccharum* sp. complex hybrid) multi-ratooning system. *In- dian Journal of Agronomy* **51**(3): 228-231.
- Venkatakrishnan D and Ravichandran M. 2007. Influence of nutrient management on growth and yield of sugarcane (var. *Co* 86032). *Plant Archives* 7(1): 99-102.



# Integrated weed management in garlic

Suresh Kumar\*, S.S. Rana, Navell Chander and Neelam Sharma

Department of Agronomy, CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh 176 062

Received: 6 April 2013; Revised: 29 May 2013

# ABSTRACT

Four herbicides (oxyflurofen 0.25 kg/ha, pendimethalin 1.50 kg/ha, trifluralin 1.50 kg/ha and metachlor 1.50 kg/ha) at recommended rates alone and at half of the recommended rates integrated with one hand weeding were compared with hand weeding 30, 60, 90 days after planting (DAP) and untreated check in silty clay loam soil during Rabi 2008-09 and 2009-10 at Palampur. Phalaris minor followed by Avena ludoviciana were the predominant associated weeds. All treatments resulted in significantly lower density of *Phalais minor*, *Alopecurous myosuroides* and *Coronopus didymus*. Metolachlor 1.50 kg/ha effectively reduced the density of *Poa annua*. Metolachlor + hand weeding, pendimethalin and pendimethalin + hand weeding effectively reduced the density of Stellaria media. Integration of hand weeding with half dose of oxyflourfen, pendimethalin and metolachlor resulted in significantly higher yield of garlic than their respective higher dose alone. Weed index was lowest and weed management index (WMI), agronomic management index (AMI) and integrated weed management index (IWMI) were highest under pendimethalin + hand weeding. Herbicide efficiency index (HEI) was highest with oxyflourfen + hand weeding. Pendimethalin + hand weeding gave highest net return due to weed control (NRwc) and was followed by pendimethalin and metolachlor + hand weeding. Pendimethalin gave highest marginal benefit cost ratio (MBCR) of 40.7 followed by pendimethalin + hand weeding and metolachlor + hand weeding. Weeds reduced the garlic bulb yield by 72.5% over the best treatment pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha + HW.

Key words: Garlic, Hand weeding, Herbicides, Integrated weed management, Pendimethalin

Garlic (*Allium sativum*) is grown for its pungent flavoured bulbs world-wide to season foods. It is cultivated commercially throughout tropical and subtropical belt of the world. It is an important cash crop of Himachal Pradesh. It is usually grown between the months of October-May, during which the weather is cool and dry that favours its growth and yield. Garlic crop is highly vulnerable to weed infestation due to its slow emergence and slow initial growth, non-branching habit, sparse foliage, shallow root system (Rahman *et al.* 2012, Lawande *et al.* 2009), frequent irrigation and high fertilizer application. It never forms a canopy with its short, vertical leaf arrangement.

Weed infestation in garlic is one of the major factors for loss in yield and bulb yield loss due to weed infestation to the tune of 30-60% (Lawande *et al.* 2009). In garlic, very close spacing and a shallow root system make mechanical method of weed control difficult and sometimes course damage to developing bulbs (Lawande *et al.* 2009). Besides non-availability and higher cost of labour, manual weeding make the method uneconomical. Moreover, being a long duration crop, single hand weeding is not sufficient to control weeds. Thus, all these situations make it necessary to rely on herbicides for an effective and timely control of weed in garlic. Pendimethalin (Mehmood et al. 2002), oxyfluorfen (Vora and Mehta 1999, Qasem 1996), metolachlor and trifluralin were found effective for managing weeds in garlic. Single application of any of herbicide is not sufficient to obtain yield equal to weed free treatment (Mehmood et al. 2002, Vora and Mehta 1998). However, use of herbicides at low doses in conjunction with manual weeding (Madan et al. 1994; Ankur et al. 2002, Singh and Nandal 2002) is more effective, environmentally safe, socially acceptable and economically viable. Information on integrated weed management methods in garlic in the agro-climatic conditions of mid-hills of Himachal Pradesh (India) is meager. Hence, the present investigation was undertaken to identify effective integrated weed management options in garlic.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted during *Rabi* 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 at Palampur (32°6' N Latitude, 76°3' E longitude, 1280 m above mean sea level). The soil of the experimental site was silty clay loam in texture, acidic in reaction (pH 6.1), medium in available N (333.4

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: skg\_63@yahoo.com

kg/ha) and P (18.9 kg/ha) and high in K (226.4 kg/ha). The treatments consisted of four herbicides (oxyflurofen 0.25 kg/ha, pendimethalin 1.50 kg/ha, trifluralin 1.50 kg/ ha and metachlor 1.50 kg/ha) at recommended rates alone and at half of the recommended rate with one hand weeding, three hand weedings (30, 60, 90 days after planting DAP) and unweeded check (Table 1). Well decomposed FYM 10 t/ha was applied uniformly at the time of field preparation. Garlic variety 'GCH-1' was planted on 5 October 2008 and 17 October 2009. The crop was fertilized with 60 kg N, 50 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and 30 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha. Required amount of N, P and K was supplied through urea, single super phosphate and muriate of potash, respectively. Except weed control treatments, the recommended cultural practices and plant protection measures were followed to raise the crop. Weeding was done manually with the help of hand tool 'Khuni'. Herbicides were applied with the help of Maruyama power sprayer using flat fan nozzle delivering 700 litres of water per ha. Trifluralin was applied as pre-plant soil incorporation (PPI) (Just before planting), pendimethalin, oxyflurofen and metachlor as pre-emergence (just after planting). Weed density and biomass at 90 DAS and at harvest were recorded by placing 50 x 50 cm quadrates at two random places in each plot. After drying samples in hot air oven  $(70 \pm 1^{\circ}C \text{ for } 72)$ h), weed dry weight was recorded. Data were subjected to square root transformation  $(\sqrt{x+1})$ . The crop was harvested on 23 May 2009 and 26 May 2010, respectively. Yields were harvested from net plot. The different impact indices were worked out after Walia (2003)

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Effect on weeds

Garlic crop was infested with a large number of weeds owing to longer duration, slow initial growth, non-tillering/ branching habit and sparce canopy development besides frequent irrigation and high fertilizer application. Phalaris minor was the most predominant weed constituting 30.9 and 40% of the total weed flora at 90 DAP and at harvest, respectively. The count of Phalaris during 2009-10 was twice of its count during 2008-09. Similarly, density of Avena ludoviciana was higher during 2009-10 as compared to 2008-09. Its density was greater at harvest than at 90 DAP during both the years. It constituted 12.8% of total weed flora at 90 DAP and 13.5% at harvest. Similar trend was observed with Vicia sativa. While density of Poa annua (11.8 and 3.5%, respectively at 90 DAP and at harvest), Stellaria media (14.5 and 6.2%), Lolium temulentum (3.6 and 0.0%) and other weeds (Anagallis arvensis, Spergulla arvensis, Polygonum alatum and Gallinsoga parviflora) (20.3 and 3.8%) decreased at harvest when compared to its density at 90 DAP. *Coronopus didymus* (14.1%), *Ranunculus arvensis* (1.8%) and *Alopecurous myosuroides* (8.5%) were present only at harvest.

All weed control treatments were more effective during 2008-09 than during 2009-10 (Table 1) and their efficacy was higher on grasses than broad-leaved weeds. *Vicia sativa* and the other weeds were not effectively controlled by oxyflurofen 0.25 kg/ha, pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha, triflurolin 1.5 kg/ha and metolachlor 1.5 kg/ha especially during 2008-09. Mehmood *et al.* (2002) have reported similar results. However, when hand weeding was integrated with half dose of these herbicides, control of these weeds has improved.

At harvest, hand weeding thrice resulted in significantly lower density of Phalaris minor and Avena ludoviciana during 2008-09 (Table 2). All other treatments resulted in significantly lower density of Phalais minor but oxyflourfen 0.25 kg/ha could not significantly lower down the density of Avena ludoviciana over weedy check during 2008-09. Metolachlor 1.50 kg/ha effectively reduced the density of Poa annua. However, all the other treatments had statistically equal count of Poa as under weedy check. All weed control treatments were significantly superior to weedy check in reducing the count of Vicia sativa and Ranunculus arvensis at harvest during 2008-09. Pendimethalin, pendimethalin + hand weeding and metolachlor + hand weeding were as good as hand weeding thrice in reducing density of Vicia sativa. All the weed control treatments except trifluralin + hand weeding were comparable to hand weeding thrice in influencing the count of Ranunculus. Density of Coronopus didymus was significantly lower under all the treatments at harvest during 2008-09. However, during 2009-10, Coronopus didymus and Steallaria media were observed to be suppressed under weedy check and the population of the weed under the weed control treatments was either significantly higher or not different from that under weedy check. Metolachlor + hand weeding was at par with pendimethalin and pendimethalin + hand weeding in effectively reducing the density of Stellaria media than other treatments. Oxyflourfen and oxyflourfen + hand weeding were as good as hand weeding thrice in reducing the density of other weeds. But, all the other treatments were not effective against other weeds during 2008-09. There was build up of Alopecurous myosuroides under hand weeding thrice at harvest during 2009-10.

All the weed control treatments resulted in significantly lower total weed density and total weed biomass (Table 3). Owing to species-wise reduction in the density of weeds, oxyfluorfen 0.15 kg/ha + HW,

Table 1. Effect of different weed management treatments on weed density (no./m<sup>2</sup>) at 90 days after planting of garlic

|                                   | Ph     | alaris  | Aı     | vena   | La    | olium  | ŀ      | Poa    | V      | icia   | Ste   | llaria | Ot     | hers   |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| Treatment                         | 2008-  | 2009-   | 2008-  | 2009-  | 2008  | 2009-  | 2008-  | 2009-  | 2008-  | 2009-  | 2008  | 2009-  | 2008-  | 2009-  |
|                                   | 09     | 10      | 09     | 10     | -09   | 10     | 09     | 10     | 09     | 10     | -09   | 10     | 09     | 10     |
| T <sub>1</sub> - Oxyflurofen      | 1.0    | 3.4     | 1.0    | 1.8    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 1.0    | 1.7    | 4.0    | 1.4    | 3.2   | 1.7    | 1.0    | 1.0    |
| 0.25 kg/ha                        | (0.0)  | (10.7)  | (0.0)  | (2.7)  | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (2.7)  | (14.7) | (1.3)  | (9.3) | (2.7)  | (0.0)  | (0.0)  |
| T <sub>2</sub> - Oxyflurofen + HW | 1.0    | 2.1     | 1.0    | 3.5    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 1.0    | 1.0    | 1.0    | 1.4    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 1.0    | 1.4    |
| 0.25 kg/ha                        | (0.0)  | (4.0)   | (0.0)  | (12.0) | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (1.3)  | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (0.0)  | (1.3)  |
| T <sub>3</sub> - Pendimethalin    | 1.0    | 2.9     | 1.0    | 2.6    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 1.0    | 2.3    | 3.2    | 2.2    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 2.9    | 1.7    |
| 1.50 kg/ha                        | (0.0)  | (8.0)   | (0.0)  | (8.0)  | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (5.3)  | (9.3)  | (4.0)  | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (8.0)  | (2.7)  |
| T <sub>4</sub> - Pendimethalin +  | 1.0    | 2.5     | 1.0    | 2.1    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 1.0    | 2.1    | 1.0    | 2.1    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 1.0    | 1.4    |
| HW 1.50 kg/ha                     | (0.0)  | (5.3)   | (0.0)  | (4.0)  | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (4.0)  | (0.0)  | (4.0)  | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (0.0)  | (1.3)  |
| T <sub>5</sub> - Trifluralin      | 3.0    | 3.3     | 1.0    | 1.8    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 1.4    | 1.4    | 3.8    | 2.1    | 1.4   | 1.8    | 5.4    | 1.0    |
| 1.50 kg/ha                        | (8.0)  | (10.7)  | (0.0)  | (2.7)  | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (1.3)  | (1.3)  | (13.3) | (4.0)  | (1.3) | (2.7)  | (28.0) | (0.0)  |
| T <sub>6</sub> - Trifluralin + HW | 1.0    | 3.0     | 1.0    | 2.1    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 2.1    | 1.4    | 1.0    | 2.1    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 1.0    | 1.4    |
| 1.50 kg/ha                        | (0.0)  | (8.0)   | (0.0)  | (4.0)  | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (4.0)  | (1.3)  | (0.0)  | (2.0)  | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (0.0)  | (1.3)  |
| T <sub>7</sub> - Metolachlor      | 1.0    | 3.6     | 1.0    | 2.9    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 1.7    | 2.1    | 3.4    | 2.5    | 1.8   | 1.8    | 4.9    | 1.0    |
| 1.50 kg/ha                        | (0.0)  | (12.0)  | (0.0)  | (9.3)  | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (2.7)  | (4.0)  | (10.7) | (5.3)  | (2.7) | (2.7)  | (22.7) | (0.0)  |
| T <sub>8</sub> - Metolachlor +    | 1.0    | 2.5     | 1.0    | 3.4    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 2.3    | 1.0    | 1.0    | 1.4    | 1.0   | 1.8    | 1.0    | 1.9    |
| HW 1.50 kg/ha                     | (0.0)  | (5.3)   | (0.0)  | (10.7) | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (5.3)  | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (1.3)  | (0.0) | (2.7)  | (0.0)  | (4.0)  |
| T9- Hand weeding                  | 1.0    | 2.3     | 1.0    | 1.4    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 1.0    | 2.5    | 1.0    | 2.5    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 1.0    | 1.0    |
| (HW)                              | (0.0)  | (5.3)   | (0.0)  | (1.3)  | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (0.0)  | (6.7)  | (0.0)  | (5.3)  | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (0.0)  | (0.0)  |
| T <sub>10</sub> - Unweeded        | 7.9    | 11.3    | 4.2    | 7.9    | 3.2   | 3.8    | 5.8    | 6.3    | 4.6    | 4.3    | 4.4   | 8.5    | 10.4   | 4.1    |
|                                   | (61.3) | (128.0) | (17.3) | (61.3) | (9.)  | (13.3) | (33.3) | (38.7) | (20.)  | (17.3) | (18.) | (70.7) | (108.) | (16.0) |
| LSD (P=0.05)                      | 0.1    | 1.3     | 0.6    | 1.7    | 0.2   | 0.3    | 1.2    | 1.4    | 0.4    | 1.2    | 0.6   | 1.1    | 0.5    | 1.1    |

Values given in the parentheses are the original means

 Table 2. Effect of different weed management treatments on different weed species density (no./m²) at the harvest of garlic

| Treatment      | Pha    | laris   | Ave    | ena    | Poa a  | innua  | Vie    | cia    | Ranur | ıculus | Stell  | aria   | Alope  | curous | Oth    | ners   |
|----------------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                | 2008-  | 2009-   | 2008-  | 2009-  | 2008-  | 2009-  | 2008-  | 2009-  | 2008- | 2009-  | 2008-  | 2009-  | 2008-  | 2009-  | 2008-  | 2009-  |
|                | 09     | 10      | 09     | 10     | 09     | 10     | 09     | 10     | 09    | 10     | 09     | 10     | 09     | 10     | 09     | 10     |
| $T_1$          | 3.6    | 3.0     | 5.3    | 2.9    | 3.5    | 1.9    | 4.1    | 2.7    | 1.4   | 1.0    | 2.9    | 3.8    | 1.0    | 1.9    | 1.0    | 1.0    |
|                | (12.0) | (8.0)   | (26.7) | (8.0)  | (12.0) | (4.0)  | (16.0) | (6.7)  | (1.3) | (0.0)  | (8.0)  | (13.3) | (0.0)  | (4.0)  | (0.0)  | (0.0)  |
| $T_2$          | 4.0    | 4.1     | 3.4    | 1.0    | 4.1    | 2.7    | 3.8    | 2.3    | 1.4   | 1.4    | 4.1    | 3.2    | 1.0    | 1.0    | 1.9    | 1.7    |
|                | (14.7) | (16.0)  | (10.7) | (0.0)  | (16.0) | (6.7)  | (13.3) | (5.3)  | (1.3) | (1.3)  | (16.0) | (9.3)  | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (4.0)  | (2.7)  |
| T <sub>3</sub> | 4.7    | 2.7     | 3.4    | 2.7    | 3.6    | 1.7    | 3.4    | 3.6    | 1.0   | 1.8    | 2.2    | 1.4    | 1.0    | 2.7    | 4.4    | 3.2    |
|                | (21.3) | (6.7)   | (10.0) | (6.7)  | (12.0) | (2.7)  | (10.7) | (12.0) | (0.0) | (2.7)  | (4.0)  | (1.3)  | (0.0)  | (8.0)  | (18.7) | (12.0) |
| $T_4$          | 3.4    | 3.6     | 2.5    | 4.1    | 4.1    | 1.9    | 3.2    | 1.7    | 1.4   | 1.0    | 2.2    | 1.8    | 1.0    | 1.7    | 3.6    | 3.8    |
|                | (10.7) | (12.0)  | (5.3)  | (16.0) | (16.0) | (4.0)  | (9.3)  | (2.7)  | (1.3) | (0.0)  | (4.0)  | (2.7)  | (0.0)  | (2.7)  | (12.0) | (13.3) |
| T <sub>5</sub> | 3.6    | 2.0     | 3.8    | 3.1    | 4.4    | 1.9    | 4.0    | 3.6    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 3.6    | 1.9    | 1.0    | 1.4    | 7.1    | 2.7    |
|                | (12.0) | (5.3)   | (13.3) | (10.7) | (18.7) | (4.0)  | (14.7) | (12.0) | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (12.0) | (4.0)  | (0.0)  | (1.3)  | (49.3) | (8.0)  |
| $T_6$          | 4.1    | 3.6     | 3.6    | 3.8    | 3.7    | 3.3    | 4.4    | 3.6    | 2.1   | 1.8    | 3.6    | 2.3    | 1.0    | 2.3    | 4.1    | 2.9    |
|                | (16.0) | (12.0)  | (12.0) | (13.3) | (13.3) | (10.7) | (18.7) | (12.0) | (4.0) | (2.7)  | (12.0) | (5.3)  | (0.0)  | (5.3)  | (16.0) | (8.0)  |
| $T_7$          | 3.1    | 5.0     | 3.1    | 4.5    | 1.0    | 1.0    | 4.0    | 3.0    | 1.0   | 1.4    | 3.4    | 6.6    | 1.0    | 1.7    | 7.8    | 4.9    |
|                | (9.3)  | (24.0)  | (9.3)  | (20.0) | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (14.7) | (8.0)  | (0.0) | (1.3)  | (10.7) | (52.0) | (0.0)  | (2.7)  | (60.0) | (30.7) |
| $T_8$          | 4.4    | 4.6     | 3.6    | 4.4    | 2.5    | 2.3    | 3.2    | 3.4    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 1.8    | 1.7    | 1.0    | 1.0    | 8.3    | 4.5    |
|                | (18.)7 | (20.0)  | (12.0) | (18.7) | (5.3)  | (5.3)  | (9.3)  | (10.7) | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (2.7)  | (2.7)  | (0.0)  | (0.0)  | (68.0) | (25.3) |
| Τ9             | 1.8    | 6.3     | 1.0    | 3.9    | 4.3    | 3.6    | 3.0    | 2.5    | 1.0   | 1.0    | 3.2    | 3.2    | 1.0    | 3.4    | 2.2    | 7.2    |
|                | (2.7)  | (38.7)  | (0.0)  | (14.7) | (17.3) | (12.0) | (8.0)  | (6.7)  | (0.0) | (0.0)  | (9.3)  | (9.3)  | (0.0)  | (10.7) | (6.7)  | (50.7) |
| $T_{10}$       | 7.6    | 11.2    | 5.0    | 6.2    | 3.8    | 1.7    | 5.2    | 3.6    | 3.0   | 1.0    | 5.1    | 1.7    | 5.0    | 4.0    | 4.3    | 1.0    |
|                | (57.3) | (124.0) | (24.0) | (37.3) | (13.3) | (2.7)  | (26.7) | (12.0) | (8.0) | (0.0)  | (25.3) | (2.7)  | (24.0) | (14.7) | (17.3) | (0.0)  |
| LSD            | 0.9    | 1.2     | 0.8    | 1.2    | 0.9    | 1.2    | 0.6    | NS     | 0.9   | NS     | 0.9    | 2.4    | 0.4    | 1.5    | 1.5    | 2.7    |
| (P=0.05)       |        |         |        |        |        |        |        |        |       |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

Values given in the parentheses are the original means

|                |         | Total weed | density (no | o./m <sup>2</sup> ) | Т      | otal weed b | iomass (g⁄ | <sup>(</sup> m <sup>2</sup> ) | Garlic yield (t/ha) |       |      |
|----------------|---------|------------|-------------|---------------------|--------|-------------|------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|-------|------|
| Treatment      | 200     | 08-09      | 2           | 009-10              | 20     | 08-09       | 20         | 09-10                         | 2008-               | 2009- |      |
|                | 90 DAP  | At harvest | 90 DAP      | At harvest          | 90 DAP | At harvest  | 90 DAP     | At harvest                    | 09                  | 10    | Mean |
| $T_1$          | 5.0     | 9.2        | 4.5         | 6.8                 | 1.4    | 3.2         | 1.4        | 3.4                           | 2.87                | 1.85  | 2.36 |
|                | (24.0)  | (84.0)     | (20.00      | (45.3)              | (1.1   | (9.2)       | (0.9)      | (11.2)                        |                     |       |      |
| $T_2$          | 1.0     | 9.4        | 45          | 6.7                 | 1.0    | 1.9         | 1.9        | 3.2                           | 3.88                | 3.38  | 3.64 |
|                | (0.0)   | (88.0)     | (20.0)      | (44.0)              | (0.0)  | (2.9)       | (3.0)      | (9.5)                         |                     |       |      |
| $T_3$          | 5.0     | 9.6        | 5.5         | 7.4                 | 1.4    | 1.9         | 2.2        | 3.8                           | 4.22                | 3.23  | 3.73 |
|                | (24.0)  | (92.0)     | (29.3)      | (53.3)              | (1.0)  | (3.1)       | (3.9)      | (13.9)                        |                     |       |      |
| $T_4$          | 1.0     | 9.1        | 4.6         | 9.0                 | 1.0    | 1.7         | 1.1        | 6.4                           | 4.11                | 4.77  | 4.44 |
|                | (0.0)   | (82.7)     | (20.0)      | (81.3)              | (0.0)  | (2.1)       | (0.3)      | (40.9)                        |                     |       |      |
| T <sub>5</sub> | 8.5     | 12.4       | 4.8         | 7.7                 | 1.8    | 4.0         | 1.5        | 4.5                           | 2.72                | 2.15  | 2.44 |
|                | (70.7)  | (153.3)    | (22.7)      | (61.3)              | (2.2)  | (15.3)      | (1.6)      | (23.5)                        |                     |       |      |
| $T_6$          | 2.1     | 10.2       | 4.9         | 9.1                 | 1.0    | 2.1         | 1.2        | 5.3                           | 2.98                | 1.69  | 2.34 |
|                | (4.0)   | (102.7)    | (24.0)      | (82.7)              | (0.0)  | (3.8)       | (0.3)      | (28.1)                        |                     |       |      |
| $T_7$          | 7.4     | 11.6       | 5.8         | 7.2                 | 1.7    | 4.2         | 1.8        | 3.7                           | 2.81                | 1.38  | 2.10 |
|                | (53.3)  | (134.7)    | (33.3)      | (50.7)              | (1.8)  | (17.0)      | (2.4)      | (13.2)                        |                     |       |      |
| $T_8$          | 2.3     | 11.3       | 4.9         | 7.6                 | 1.0    | 4.4         | 1.4        | 4.9                           | 3.78                | 3.38  | 3.58 |
| -              | (5.3)   | (126.7)    | (24.0)      | (57.3)              | (0.0)  | (19.2)      | (1.1)      | (23.4)                        |                     |       |      |
| T9             | 1.0     | 7.3        | 4.8         | 8.8                 | 1.0    | 1.6         | 1.3        | 4.9                           | 4.11                | 1.88  | 2.99 |
|                | (0.0)   | (53.3)     | (22.7)      | (77.3)              | (0.0)  | (1.8)       | (0.7)      | (23.4)                        |                     |       |      |
| $T_{10}$       | 20.8    | 17.0       | 18.9        | 11.8                | 5.6    | 7.4         | 11.2       | 8.0                           | 1.39                | 1.05  | 1.22 |
|                | (432.0) | (289.3)    | (356.0)     | (137.3)             | (30.3) | (54.3)      | (123.6)    | (63.9)                        |                     |       |      |
| LSD (P=0.05)   | · · · · | 1.2        | 1.4         | 1.7                 | 0.2    | 1.1         | 0.8        | 1.7                           | 0.60                | 0.31  | 0.46 |

Table 3. Effect of different weed management treatments on yield of garlic, density and weed biomass

Values given in the parentheses are the original means

pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha + HW and hand weeding thrice were statistically on par with each other in reducing weed density at 90 DAS. At harvest, oxyflurofen 0.25 kg/ha, pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha and trifluralin 0.75 kg/ha + HW were on par with above treatments. Oxyflurofen 0.15 kg/ ha + HW, pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha, pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha + HW, trifluoralin 0.75 kg/ha + HW and metolachlor 0.75 kg/ha + HW were statistically equally effective in significantly lowering total weed biomassas compared to other weed control treatments.

#### Effect on crop

Weeds in unweeded check reduced the garlic bulb yield by 72.5% over the best treatment pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha + HW (Table 3). Among the herbicides, pendimethalin resulted in highest bulb yield. The other herbicides, *viz.* oxyflourfen, metolachlor and trifluralin were comparable to each other. Integration of hand weeding with half dose of oxyflourfen, pendimethalin and metolachlor resulted in significantly higher yield of garlic than their respective higher dose alone. This indicated that hand weeding could economies the dose of the herbicides by 50%. Pendimethalin and pendimethalin/metolachlor/oxyflourfen + hand weeding were superior to hand weeding thrice in increasing bulb yield of garlic. Sandhu *et al.* (1997), Ankur *et al.* (2002), Singh and Nandal (2002) have reported similar results with the integration of hand weeding with pendimethalin. The bulb yield of garlic was negatively associated with weed density (r= -0.320 to -0.852) and weed biomass (r= - 0.13 to -0.832); with significantly higher association during 2008-09 than during 2009-10. Irrespective of species, with every one weed/m<sup>2</sup> increase in density of weeds, garlic bulb yield would be expected to fall by 5.3 kg/ha (Y= 3199.4 – 5.328 x, R<sup>2</sup>= 0.298). Similarly, every g/m<sup>2</sup> increase in biomass of weeds would result in 35 kg/ha loss in bulb yield of garlic (Y= 3547.5 – 34.963 x, R<sup>2</sup>= 0.430).

#### Impact assessment

Weed control efficiency under treatments ranged from 77.7 (in trifluralin) to 93.5% (oxyflourfen + hand weeding) (Table 4). Weed management index (WMI), agronomic management index (AMI) and integrated weed management index (IWMI) were highest under pendimethalin + hand weeding. It was followed by metolachlor + hand weeding, pendimethalin, oxyflourfen + hand weeding and hand weeding thrice. Herbicide efficiency index (HEI) which indicates weed killing potential and phytotoxicity

| Treatment          | WCE<br>(%) | WMI  | AMI  | IWMI | HEI   | WI    | GR<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹ | GRwc<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹ | CWC<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹ | NRwc<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹ | MBCR |
|--------------------|------------|------|------|------|-------|-------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------|
|                    |            |      |      |      |       |       | /ha)                      | /ha)                        | /ha)                       | /ha)                        |      |
| Oxyflurofen        | 88.6       | 2.33 | 1.33 | 1.83 | 5.39  | 21.3  | 109.29                    | 52.38                       | 2.16                       | 50.22                       | 23.2 |
| Oxyflurofen + HW   | 93.5       | 3.33 | 2.33 | 2.83 | 18.85 | -21.3 | 170.18                    | 113.27                      | 3.85                       | 109.41                      | 28.4 |
| Pendimethalin      | 89.4       | 3.56 | 2.56 | 3.06 | 14.26 | -24.3 | 173.65                    | 116.75                      | 2.80                       | 113.95                      | 40.7 |
| Pendimethalin + HW | 80.5       | 5.71 | 4.71 | 5.21 | 7.24  | -48.1 | 209.66                    | 152.75                      | 3.80                       | 148.95                      | 39.2 |
| Trifluralin        | 77.7       | 2.97 | 1.97 | 2.47 | 3.03  | 18.7  | 113.70                    | 56.80                       | 1.86                       | 54.94                       | 29.5 |
| Trifluralin + HW   | 84.7       | 2.62 | 1.62 | 2.12 | 3.38  | 22.0  | 107.90                    | 50.99                       | 3.70                       | 47.29                       | 12.8 |
| Metolachlor        | 81.7       | 2.31 | 1.31 | 1.81 | 2.81  | 30.0  | 96.55                     | 39.64                       | 1.50                       | 38.14                       | 25.4 |
| Metolachlor + HW   | 80.1       | 4.58 | 3.58 | 4.08 | 5.36  | -19.5 | 167.74                    | 110.83                      | 3.30                       | 107.53                      | 32.6 |
| Hand weeding (HW)  | 87.9       | 3.12 | 2.12 | 2.62 | 6.82  | 0.0   | 137.56                    | 80.65                       | 9.82                       | 70.83                       | 7.2  |
| Unweeded           | 0.0        | -    | -    | -    | 0.00  | 59.3  | 56.90                     | 0                           | 0                          | 0                           | 0.0  |

Table 4. Impact assessment indices and economics of weed management treatments

WCE - weed control efficiency; WMI - weed management index; AMI - agronomic management index; IWMI - integrated weed management index; HEI - Herbicide efficiency index; WI - weed index; GR - gross returns; GRwc - gross returns due to weed control; CWC - cost of weed control; NRwc - net returns due to weed control; MBCR - marginal benefit: cost ratio

on the crop (Walia 2003), was highest under oxyflourfen + hand weeding. This was followed by pendimethalin, pendimethalin + hand weeding, hand weeding thrice and oxyflourfen. Pendimethalin + hand weeding had lowest weed index (WI) and was followed by pendimethalin, oxyflourfen + hand weeding and metolachlor + hand weeding. Rest of the treatments had higher weed index indicating lower yield than hand weeding thrice.

Gross returns (GR) and gross returns due to weed control (GRwc) followed the trend of yield and were highest under pendimethalin + hand weeding, pendimethalin, oxyflourfen + hand weeding and metolachlor + hand weeding. Cost of weed control was lower with herbicides/integrated weed control treatments than with hand weeding thrice. Net return due to weed control (NRwc) followed the trend of GRwc and was higher under pandimethalin + hand weeding, pendimethalin, oxyflourfen + hand weeding and metolachlor + hand weeding. All treatments resulted in higher MBCR over hand weeding thrice. Pendimethalin gave highest MBCR of 40.7 followed by pendimethalin + hand weeding, metolachlor + hand weeding, trifluralin + hand weeding, oxyflourfen + hand weeding and metolachlor.

Pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha + hand weeding, oxyflourfen 0.125 kg/ha + hand weeding and metolachlor + hand weeding may be recommended for economically viable weed management in garlic, under mid-hills conditions of Himachal Pradesh.

- Ankur V, Nandal TR and Singh R. 2002. Nutrient uptake and economic weed management in garlic (*Allium sativum L.*). Indian Journal of Weed Science 33: 3-4.
- Lawande KE, Khar A, Mahajan V, Srinivas PS, Sankar V and Singh RP. 2009. Onion and garlic research in India. *Journal of Horticultural Sciences* 4(2): 91-119.
- Madan SP, Jassal S and Saimbhi MS. 1994. Herbicidal control of weeds in garlic. *Punjab Vegetable Grower* **29**: 1-2.
- Qasem JR. 1996. Weed competition in garlic (*Allium sativum* L.). Journal of Horticultural Sciences **71**: 41-48.
- Rahman UH, Khattak AM, Sadiq M, Ullah K, Javeria S and Ullah I. 2012. Influence of different weed management practices on yield of garlic crop. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture* 28(2): 213-218.
- Sandhu KS, Singh D and Singh J. 1997. Weed management in garlic (*Allium sativum* L.). *Vegetable Science* 24: 7-9.
- Singh R and Nandal TR. 2002. Studies on weed management in garlic (Allium sativum L). Indian Journal of Weed Science 34: 80-81.
- Mehmood T, Hussain S I, Khokhar KM, Jeelani G and Hidayatullah. 2002. Weed control in garlic crop in relation to weedicides. *Asian Journal of Plant Sciences* 1: 412-413.
- Vora VD and Mehta DR. 1998. Integrated weed management in winter garlic. *Agricultural Science Digest* **18**: 237-239.
- Vora VD and Mehta DR. 1999. Studies on growth, yield and yield attributes of garlic as influenced by herbicides and weeds. *Agricultural Science Digest* **19**: 129-133.
- Walia US. 2003. Weed Management. Kalyani Publishers, Ludhiana 396 p.

Indian Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 131–134, 2013

# **Evaluation of toxins of phytopathogenic fungus for eco-friendly management** of *Parthenium*

Jaya Singh\*, Saurabh Gupta, Suraj Singh Chauhan and Deepak Mishra<sup>1</sup>

Research Institute of Biodiversity Conservation & Rural Biotechnology Centre, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh 482 002

Received: 7 January 2013; Revised: 3 May 2013

# ABSTRACT

Herbicidal potential of CFCF (cell free culture filtrate) of *Phoma herbarum* (FGCCPH#27) against *Parthenium hysterophorus* was determined by shoot cut, seedling and detached leaf bioassays. Maximum mortality was shown by the inoculum formulated with sucrose + Tween-20 followed by Tween-80. Triton-X was found to be highly inhibiting in its action. Maximum average leaf area damage (LAD) of 85% on the seventh day and 65% of leaf damage by fourth day was observed when treated with CFCF obtained from 14 day's old fermented broth at 50% concentration followed by 75 and 100%. Maximum phytotoxicity was obtained from 14 day's old fermented broth with sucrose + tween 20 0.5% as formulating agent. Chlorophyll and protein contents were also significantly affected when treated with CFCF. The contents were gradually decreased with increased incubation. Maximum reduction was recorded in shoots treated with CFCF obtained from 14 days old fermented broth at 50% concentration followed by 75% and 100% (Table 4). 14 days old fermented broth showed the maximum biological activity as depicted by the significant reduction in the chlorophyll and protein content of the host leaves. While extract obtained from 7 days old broth failed to show any remarkable reduction in these contents at similar concentration. The effect was comparatively more on chlorophyll-a and total chlorophyll while chlorophyll-b and protein contents were less affected.

Key words: Herbicidal potential, Formulation, Parthnium hysterophorus Phoma herbarum, Phytotoxicity

Parthenium hysterophorus L., commonly known as carrot weed, is an obnoxious, annual and deadly weed of compositae family, native of North America. It poses serious threat to crops, livestock and human beings. It is responsible for the substantial losses to the crops. It reduces agricultural yield by 40% and forage production by 90% (Knox et al. 2006). Conventional methods of its management rely mainly on the use of chemical herbicides. Public concern over the safety due to indiscriminate use of synthetic herbicides has generated significant pressure on weed scientists to search an alternative of these chemicals. Exploitation of microorganisms and especially their biorationals (natural products) as herbicides have generated significant interest world wide. (Pandey et al. 2002, 2005). Survey conducted at various habitats of central India for weed pathogens yielded an isolate of Phoma herbarum (FGCCPH#27) which incites severe collar rot disease in Parthenium (Pandey et al. 1996). Mycoherbicidal potential of the pathogen is known to influence by environmental factors. To overcome these constraints, second-

\*Corresponding author: dr.jayasingh@yahoo.com <sup>1</sup>A.K.S. University, Satna, Madhya Pradesh ary metabolites especially oxalic acid synthesized by the pathogen have also tried (Pandey *et al.* 2003). Oxalic acid produced by the pathogen showed high herbicidal potential against *Parthenium*. Normal application of oxalic acid did not produced noticeable results and need a suitable formulating agent for its effective herbicidal potential. Therefore, the present investigation was under taken with the formulation and *in vitro* evaluation of herbicidal potential of the pathogen against *Parthenium* by shoot cut, seedling and detached leaf bioassay, methods.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

*Phoma herbarum* (FGCCPH#27) was obtained from fungal germplasm collection Centre, BCRBC, Jabalpur, previously isolated from the diseased part of the target weed and maintained on Potato Dextrose Agar (PDA) medium.

## **Preparation and extraction of CFCF**

1000 ml Erlenmeyer flasks containing 500 ml of Richard's broth were seeded with 5 mm disc obtained from 7 days old cultures grown on PDA medium at 28°C. Inoculated flasks were incubated at 38  $\pm$ 2°C for 7 and 14 days. Fermented broth was filtered through Whatman's filter paper No.1 and the filtrate was centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 10 min. Supernatant was discarded and the crude filtrate was again passed through 0.2511n Sartorious filter *in vacuo* condition (Abbas *et al.* 1992).

#### Formulation

To test the compatibility of the toxin synthesized by the pathogen a total of 15 formulating agents were tried. All the formulating agents were added at the rate of 0.5% to the toxin and its herbicidal potential was determined by shoot cut assay and observations were made for three days (Daigle and Conick 2002).

# **Bioassay**

Seedlings were raised in pots containing soil, sand and peat in 1:1:1 ratio. Different formulations containing 50% toxin of *P. herbarum* (7 and 14 days old) sprayed at different concentration on host seedlings 30 ml per plant grown in pots and maintained in green house. Each treatment was replicated thrice and observations were recorded after 3 days based on a score chart. Per cent disease index was calculated by using the following formula (Praveena 2003).

Per cent disease index= 
$$\frac{\text{Sum of score of each leaf}}{\text{No. of leaves scored} \times} \times 100$$
  
maximum score

Leaves from the host target weed were surface sterilized with 2% NaOCI and were kept on a sterilized moisture chamber prepared by using cotton and filter paper in a Petridish. (Thapar *et al.* 2002). Various dilutions of toxic metabolites were used of 7 and 14 days old fermented broth, *viz.* 50% and 100% with Tween 80 0.5% and the effects were observed after 24 hrs.

#### Chlorophyll and protein contents

One g of fresh leaves were homogenized with ethanol in a mortar and pestle and centrifuged at 8000 rpm for 2 min., with 80% ethanol. Supernatant was taken in other flask and diluted with ethanol. Absorbance of the extract was measured by UV-Vis Systronics Spectrophotometer at 645 and 663 nm for the determination of chlorophyll a, b and total chlorophyll. The protein content was determined as per Lowry *et al.* (1951).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Formulation

Maximum mortality was shown by the inoculum formulated with sucrose + Tween-20 followed by Tween-80. Triton-X was found to be highly inhibiting in its action. Rest of the agents produced average effect on the host shoots. Findings obtained in the above study clearly revealed the herbicidal potential of the pathogen against *Parthenium* (Table 1). Maximum toxicity obtained at 50% concentration with sucrose + Tween 20 indicated the toxin compatibility with the formulating agent. However, others did not produce significant damage to the host shoots. Variations in different formulation might be due to the compatibility of the organism with various formulating agent. Similar findings have also been made by Singh (2002).

## **Bioassay**

Cell free culture filtrate (CFCF) obtained from different incubations had varied effect on host seedlings. Maximum average leaf area damage (LAD) of 85% on the seventh day and 65% of leaf damage by fourth day was observed when treated with CFCF obtained from 14 day's old fermented broth at 50% concentration followed by 75 and 100%. CFCF obtained from 14 days old fermented broth showed the maximum toxicity due to the maximum production of oxalic acid (Table 2). CFCF obtained from 7 days old fermented broth also showed considerable toxicity at higher concentration. Similar observations have also reported by other workers (Saxena *et al.* 

Table 1. Effect of different formulations on host seedings

| Formulating agent         | % disease intensity<br>(day) |   |   |   |    |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|---|---|---|----|--|--|--|--|
|                           | 2                            | 4 | 6 | 8 | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Sorbitol                  | 1                            | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4  |  |  |  |  |
| Tween-20+ water           | 2                            | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  |  |  |  |  |
| Tween -20+sucrose         | 5                            | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6  |  |  |  |  |
| Water + gelatin           | 5                            | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin + triton-X          | 2                            | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin + water             | 5                            | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6  |  |  |  |  |
| Tween-80+ sucrose+water   | 4                            | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5  |  |  |  |  |
| Tween 80                  | 2                            | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin                     | 6                            | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin + acrylamide        | 2                            | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin+ glycerol           | 1                            | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin+ coconut oil        | 1                            | 1 | 1 | 1 | Ι  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin+ soyabean           | 3                            | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin+mustard oil         | 3                            | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4  |  |  |  |  |
| Toxin+ Tween 80           | 6                            | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9  |  |  |  |  |
| Control (tichart's broth) | 0                            | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  |  |  |  |  |

Disease rating index; 1=99%, 2=95%, 3=91%, 4=82%, 5=62%, 6=38%, 7=18%, 8=9%, 9=5%, 10=1%, below 10 = 0%; Amount of agrochemical sprayed: 30 ml/plant; RH: 85%; Incubation period: 14 days

Table 2. Effect of different concentrations of toxin on host seedlings

| Concentration | Incubation period<br>% disease index |                 |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| (%)           | 7 days                               | 14 days         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25            | 25±0.01                              | 36±0.04         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50            | 59±0.04                              | $80 {\pm} 0.02$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75            | 50±0.25                              | $75 \pm 0.25$   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100           | $48 \pm 0.01$                        | 73±0.15         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0             | No effect                            | No effect       |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. Effect of different concentrations of toxin on detached leaves of host

| Concentration | Incubation period<br>% disease index |           |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| (%)           | 7 days                               | 14 days   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25            | 33±0.01                              | 55±0.01   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50            | 66±0.05                              | 95±0.25   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75            | 52±0.02                              | 78±0.03   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 100           | 49±0.01                              | 70±0.15   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0             | No effect                            | No effect |  |  |  |  |  |

Amount of agrochemical sprayed: 30 ml/plant; RH: 85%; Values given in the table are mean  $\pm$  SEm

Values are mean ± SEm; Amount of agrochemical sprayed: 5 ml/ plant; RH: 85%

| Table 4. Effect of different | concentrations of toxin | on biological con | ntents of host seedlings |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
|                              |                         |                   |                          |

|                   |                 |                 | Bi              | ological acti   | vity of CFCF    | 7               |           |                 |
|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| Concentration (%) |                 | 7 da            | ays             |                 |                 |                 |           |                 |
|                   | Chl a           | Chl b           | Total chl       | Protein         | Chl a           | Chl b           | Total chl | Protein         |
| 25                | 10.4±0.25       | 12.1±0.06       | 32.6±0.32       | 36.1±0.04       | 50.3±0.02       | 40.8±0.02       | 45.9±0.2  | 35.5±0.04       |
| 50                | 72.1±0.07       | $58.4 \pm 0.07$ | $65.4 \pm 0.28$ | $56.9 \pm 0.07$ | $97.8 \pm 0.01$ | $74.7 \pm 0.02$ | 72.5±0.0  | 76.1±0.01       |
| 75                | $68.8 \pm 0.04$ | 56.1±0.65       | 60.3±0.62       | $36.9 \pm 0.04$ | 82.2±0.25       | $68.5 \pm 0.01$ | 65.3±0.2  | 54.1±0.01       |
| 100               | 69.6±0.05       | 53.4±0.025      | 59.9±0.73       | $27.8 \pm 0.07$ | $78.1 \pm 0.01$ | $65.2 \pm .03$  | 63.4±0.3  | $42.2 \pm 0.02$ |
| 0                 | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0               | 0         | 0               |

Values are mean ± SEm; Amount of agrochemical sprayed - 30 ml/plant; RH: 85%; Chl - Chlorophyll

2001, Pandey et al. 2002). In contrast to this, workers recorded maximum toxin production after 7 days of incubation (Pandey et al. 2003) while the CFCF obtained from 14 d old fermented broth showed the maximum mortality to the host seedlings, however 7 days old broth didn't cause significant damage to the host seedlings. Similar findings have also been made by other workers. (Shukla and Pandey 2006), which indicated significant difference between the mean leaf area damage (LAD) at different concentration with a P value of 5%.

Noticeable symptoms were also observed when detached leaves were treated with CFCF of 7 and 14 days old fermented broth at various concentrations, viz. 25, 50, 75 and 100%. Leaves were completely killed at 100% concentration and more than 80% of damage was recorded at 50% concentration (Table 3). Results obtained by detached leaf assay were quite prompting to use this pathogen as herbicidal agent against the weed. Similar damage ratings were also recorded by other Effect on chlorophyll and protein contents workers (Joseph et al. 2002).

## Effect on chlorophyll and protein contents

Chlorophyll and protein contents were also significantly affected when treated with CFCF. The contents were gradually decreased with increased incubation. Maximum reduction was recorded in shoots treated with CFCF obtained from 14 days old fermented broth at 50% concentration followed by 75% and 100 % (Table 4). 14 days old fermented broth showed the maximum biological activity as depicted by the significant reduction in the chlorophyll and protein content of the host leaves. While extract obtained from 7 days old broth failed to show any remarkable reduction in these contents at similar concentration. The effect was comparatively more on chlorophyll-a and total chlorophyll while chlorophyll-b and protein contents were less affected. Variation in toxicity in relation to incubation period might be due to different phase of growth of the fungus. Metabolites required for own growth are normally synthesized during initial phase whereas most of the toxicants are formed during idiophase *i.e.* stationary phase of the fungus. (Abbas et al. 1995) also recorded 25 to 78% reduction in chlorophyll content in Datura sp. (jimson weed) tissues treated with fumonisin. Similarly, significant biological activity of CFCF of many other microorganism including fungi have also been recorded by several workers (Kovics et al. 2005, Pandey and Pandey 2005).

Based on the results, it was inferred that the present isolate P. herbarum have significant potential to produce phytotoxic compounds with high herbicidal properties against P. hysterophorus. However, detailed investigation

regarding characterization, standardization of large scale production of herbicidal compounds are to be carried out before its field application.

#### REFERENCES

- Abbas HK and Boyette CD. 1992. Phytotoxicity of fumonisin on weed and crop species. *Weed Technology* **6**: 548-552.
- Joseph S, Lal S and Pandey AK. 2002. Preliminary evaluation of herbicidal potential of *Streptomyces* WC#150 against *Lantana camara*. Annals of Plant Protection Science 10: 134-136.
- Knox, LaI, Dass Anita, Thomas Manjula and Paul MS. 2006. Management of *Parthenium hysterophorus* L. through atrazine with *Cassia uniflora* extract. *Annals of Plant Protection Science* 14(2): 1-6.
- Kovics GJ, Pandey AK and Rai MK. 2005. Phoma Saccardo and related genera: some new perspectives in taxonomy and biotechnology, pp. 129-153. In: Biodiversity of Fungi: Their Role in Human Life (Eds. Deshmukh SK and Rai MK.). Science Publishers Inc. Enfield (NH), USA. Plymouth, UK.
- Lowry OH, Rosebrough AL Fan and Randa RJ. 1951. Protein measurement with the follinphenol reagent. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **93**: 265-275.
- Pandey AK, Singh Jaya, Shrivastava GM and Rajak RC. 2003. Fungi as herbicides: current status and future prospects, pp. 305-339.
  In: *Plant Protection: A Biological Approach* (Ed. Trivedi P.C.). Aavishkar Publishers, Distributors Jaipur, India.
- Pandey AK, Shrivastava GM, Singh AK and Yenna SK. 2003. Herbicidal potential of secondary metabolites of *Sclerotium rolfsii*

against Parthenium: a preliminary observation. Journal of Basic Applied Mycology 2(1): 27-30.

- Pandey AK. 2001. Microorganisms associated with weeds; opportunities and challenges for their exploitation as herbicides. *International Journal of Mendel* **17**: 59-62.
- Pandey Archana and Pandey AK. 2005. Preliminary assessment of Colletotrichum dematium as a potential mycoherbicide against Hyptis suaveolens. Journal of Basic Applied Mycology 4: 21-22.
- Pandey Archana, Pandey AK and Rajak RC. 2002. Mycoherbicidal potential of *S.rolfsii* against *Hyptis suaveolens* L Poit. *Journal* of Tropical Forestry 18(1&2): 96-98.
- Praveen S and Kumar VR. 2002. Effect of nutritional factors on toxin production in *Alternaria triticina*: a foliar pathogen of wheat. *Annals of Plant Protection Science* **10**(1): 103-105.
- Saxena Sanjay and Pandey AK. 2002. Evaluation of an indigenous isolate of *alternaria alternata* (LC#508) for use as a mycoherbicide for *Lantana camara* L. *Crop Protection* **21**: 71-73.
- Shukla Rekha and Pandey AK. 2006. Maximization of production of oxalic acid from *Sclerotium rolfsii*, a mycoherbicidal agent against *Parthenium*. *Annals of Plant Protection Science* 14(1): 202-205.
- Thapar Riti, Singh AK, Pandey Archana and Pandey AK. 2002. Bioactivity of CFCF of *Curvularia lunata* in *Parthenium hysterophorus* L, *Journal of Basic Applied Mycology* 1: 126-129.

**Short communication** 



# Efficacy of chlorimuron-ethyl against weeds in transplanted rice

Pooran Singh Chauhan, A.K. Jha\* and Monika Soni

Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh 482 004

Received: 14 March 2013; Revised: 4 June 2013

Key words : Chlorimuron-ethyl, Transplanted rice, Weed density

Rice (Oryza sativa L.) is one of the predominant food crops of the world. It is the staple food crop for more than 70% of the Asian population. In Madhya Pradesh, rice is grown in 1.71 million ha area, with an annual production of 13.13 lakh tones but the average productivity is quite low (1.2 t/ha) as compared to national productivity of rice (Agriculture Statistics 2011). In general, rice is preferably transplanted under irrigated agro-ecosystem but weeds are the serious constraints for higher yields. Mukherjee et al. (2008) reported that weedy situation throughout the crop growth caused yield reduction to the tune of 57 to 61% in case of transplanted rice. The choice of suitable herbicide is a major problem in many cases. The new herbicide molecule i.e. chlorimuron-ethyl has been launched in India for controlling of broad-leaved weeds in transplanted rice. However, very meagre information is available about the selectivity and bio-efficacy of this herbicide in transplanted rice. Keeping above facts in views, the present work was done.

The experiment was conducted at research farm of JNKVV, Jabalpur during Kharif season 2011. Jabalpur is situated at 23°90' North latitude and 79°58' East longitude with an altitude of 411.78 metre above the mean sea level. The mean annual rainfall of Jabalpur, based on last 20 years data, is 1350 mm due to south-west monsoon between mid June to end of September with little occasional rainfall during other months. The rainfall during the crop season was 1546.3 mm and was received in 63 rainy days. Minimum and maximum temperature was 11.26°C and 32.95°C which were ideal for growth of rice crop. The soil of the experimental field was clay loam in texture, medium in available nitrogen (236.8 kg/ha), phosphorus (20.10 kg/ ha) and potassium (272.3 kg/ha) but low in organic carbon (0.62%) and neutral soil reaction (7.3 pH). The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with seven treatments during Kharif 2011 in four replications. Seven weed control treatments with different doses of chlorimuron-ethyl (3, 6, 9 and 12 g/ha), one hand weeding (20 and 40 DAT), one hand hoeing and control were observed. Studies in relation to weed like density, dry weight were observed at 25, 45 DAT and harvest. Crop parameters like plant height, number of tillers/m<sup>2</sup>, grains/panicle,

The dominated weed flora of the experimental field were: *Echinochloa colona, Cyperus iria, Commelina communis, Eclipta alba, Ceasulia axillarius* and *Alternanthera sessilis*. Soni *et al.* (2012) also observed predominance of weeds like *Echinochloa crusgalli, Cyperus iria, Ceasulia axillarius, Commelina communis* and *Eclipta alba* in transplanted rice in Jabalpur (M.P.). The results showed that twice hand weeding at 20 and 40 DAT found best for weed control in transplanted rice. The control plot where no weed control practices was done, reduced 53.40% crop yield due to infestation of these weed flora, however mechanical (hand hoeing at 20 DAT) and chemical (chlorimuronethyl 12 g/ha) weed control treatments recorded lowest crop yield reduction 6.31 and 7.71%, respectively.

The density and dry weight of weeds at 25 DAT and harvest was significantly reduced under the different doses of chlorimuron-ethyl than control plot. The weed density and dry weight was found lowest under the hand weeded treatments. Among different weed control practices, hand weeding at 20 and 40 DAT found significantly superior for reducing the grasses, sedges and broad-leaved weed density and dry weight of dominated weed flora at 25 DAT and harvest stages, respectively. However, the higher dose of chlorimuron-ethyl 12 g/ha found significant for reducing density (49.21 and 3.19/m<sup>2</sup>) and dry weight (50.84 and 3.34 g/m<sup>2</sup>) of broad-leaved weeds at 25 DAT and at harvest, respectively. Similar findings were also reported that application of chlorimuron-ethyl 9 and 12 g/ha post-emergence reduced the population of sedges and broad-leaved weeds (Table 1) over its lower dose of 6 gm/ha and weed control plot (Dubey et al. 2000).

Crop parameters like number of effective tillers/m<sup>2</sup> (185.2), grains/panicle (162.7) and 1000 grain weight (25) was found higher under hand weeded treatments which was at par with the treatments where hand hoeing was done at 20 DAT (Table 2). Among the different herbicide treated plots, chlorimuron-ethyl 12 g/ha found significant on the crop growth parameters. Number of tillers/m<sup>2</sup> (179.6), grains/panicle (157.3) and 1000 grain weight (24.31 g)

\*Corresponding author: amitagcrewa@rediffmail.com

unfilled grains/panicle, sound grains/panicle, 1000 grain weight and finally the yields was observed and analyzed. The economic viability of the treatments was also studied.

Table 1. Weed density (no./m<sup>2</sup>) and weed dry weight (g/m<sup>2</sup>) under different treatments in transplanted rice

|                   |                |           | We      | eed dens  | ity (no./   | m <sup>2</sup> )      |         | Weed dry weight (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) |         |           |         |                       |         |  |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------|---------|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------------------|---------|--|
| Treatment         | Dose<br>(g/ha) | Grassy    | weeds   | Sed       | ges         | Broad-leaved<br>weeds |         | Grassy                              | weeds   | Sedges    |         | Broad-leaved<br>weeds |         |  |
|                   | (8,)           | 25<br>DAT | Harvest | 25<br>DAT | Harves<br>t | 25<br>DAT             | Harvest | 25<br>DAT                           | Harvest | 25<br>DAT | Harvest | 25<br>DAT             | Harvest |  |
| Chlorimuron-ethyl | 3              | 5.69      | 5.90    | 4.04      | 2.15        | 9.15                  | 3.57    | 2.15                                | 1.55    | 2.29      | 1.22    | 8.38                  | 3.35    |  |
|                   |                | (31.9)    | (34.3)  | (15.8)    | (4.1)       | (83.2)                | (12.3)  | (4.1)                               | (1.9)   | (4.7)     | (1.0)   | (69.7)                | (10.7)  |  |
| Chlorimuron-ethyl | 6              | 5.40      | 6.21    | 2.24      | 1.74        | 7.72                  | 2.87    | 1.65                                | 1.11    | 1.72      | 0.89    | 11.61                 | 2.36    |  |
|                   |                | (28.6)    | (38.1)  | (4.5)     | (2.5)       | (59.0)                | (7.8)   | (2.2)                               | . ,     | (2.5)     | (0.3)   | (134.2)               | (5.1)   |  |
| Chlorimuron-ethyl | 9              | 5.30      | 6.16    | 3.06      | 1.29        | 8.27                  | 2.52    | 1.97                                | 1.26    | 1.83      | 1.22    | 7.57                  | 2.52    |  |
|                   |                | (27.6)    | (37.5)  | (8.9)     | (1.2)       | (67.8)                | (5.8)   | (3.4)                               | (1.1)   | (2.8)     | (1.0)   | (56.8)                | (5.8)   |  |
| Chlorimuron-ethyl | 12             | 5.55      | 6.16    | 2.84      | 0.84        | 7.05                  | 1.92    | 1.72                                |         | 1.60      |         | 7.17                  | 1.96    |  |
|                   |                | (30.3)    | (37.5)  | (7.5)     | (0.2)       | (49.2)                | (3.2)   | (2.5)                               | (1.2)   | (2.1)     | (0.1)   | (50.8)                | (3.3)   |  |
| Hand hoeing       | 20 DAT         | 2.90      | 0.85    | 2.00      | 0.79        | 5.99                  | 1.09    | 1.06                                | 0.82    | 0.94      | 0.75    | 5.49                  | 1.06    |  |
|                   |                | (7.9)     | (0.2)   | (3.5)     | (0.1)       | (35.4)                | (0.7)   | (0.6)                               | (0.2)   | (0.4)     | (0.1)   | (29.6)                | (0.6)   |  |
| Hand weeding      | 20 & 40        | 0.77      | 0.71    | 0.77      | 0.71        | 5.62                  | 1.08    | 1.05                                | 0.71    | 0.71      | 0.71    | 3.56                  | 1.22    |  |
|                   | DAT            | (0.1)     | (0.0)   | (0.1)     | (0.0)       | (31.1)                | (0.7)   | (0.6)                               | (0.0)   | (0.0)     | (0.0)   | (12.1)                | (1.0)   |  |
| Control           |                | 5.56      | 6.22    | 6.22      | 5.94        | 13.12                 | 12.64   | 4.31                                | 3.80    | 5.72      | 4.26    | 12.15                 | 11.87   |  |
|                   |                | (30.5)    | (38.1)  | (38.2)    | (34.8)      | (171.7)               | (159.4) | (18.0)                              | (14.0)  | (32.2)    | (17.6)  | (147.2)               | (140.4) |  |
| LSD (P=0.05)      |                | 0.96      | 0.56    | 0.69      | 0.42        | 7.14                  | 3.30    | 0.36                                | 0.50    | 0.24      | 0.15    | 3.75                  | 1.35    |  |

Figures in parentheses are original values

Table 2. Crop growth, yield, weed index and weed control efficiency under different treatments in transplanted rice

| Treatment        | Dose<br>(g/ha) | Plant<br>height<br>(cm) | Effective tillers/m <sup>2</sup> | Grains/<br>panicle | 1000-<br>grain<br>weight (g) | Grain<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Straw<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Harvest<br>index | Weed<br>index | WCE<br>at harvest | B:C<br>ratio |
|------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Chlorimuron-ethy | 3              | 72.2                    | 169.8                            | 146.2              | 24.5                         | 4.1                      | 9.2                      | 44.2             | 30.8          | 70.6              | 2.3          |
| Chlorimuron-ethy | 6              | 75.0                    | 178.0                            | 156.0              | 24.2                         | 4.4                      | 9.8                      | 45.3             | 24.4          | 77.4              | 2.5          |
| Chlorimuron-ethy | 9              | 74.9                    | 176.9                            | 156.5              | 25.0                         | 5.0                      | 10.2                     | 48.7             | 15.3          | 81.8              | 2.7          |
| Chlorimuron-ethy | 12             | 74.2                    | 179.6                            | 157.2              | 24.3                         | 5.4                      | 10.5                     | 51.5             | 7.7           | 85.5              | 3.0          |
| Hand hoeing      | 20 DAT         | 74.6                    | 182.9                            | 158.2              | 24.9                         | 5.5                      | 10.4                     | 54.6             | 6.3           | 87.9              | 3.1          |
| Hand weedings    | 20 & 40 DAT    | 76.6                    | 185.2                            | 162.7              | 24.9                         | 5.9                      | 10.6                     | 56.3             | 0.0           | 90.7              | 2.6          |
| Control          |                | 76.2                    | 144.2                            | 93.2               | 22.1                         | 2.7                      | 8.0                      | 34.3             | 53.4          | -                 | 1.7          |
| LSD (P=0.05)     |                | 5.6                     | 3.2                              | 0.7                |                              | 5.5                      | 6.4                      | 4.2              | 5.7           |                   |              |

was recorded highest under 12 g/ha chlorimuron-ethyl treated plot. The control plot recorded lowest effective number of tillers/m<sup>2</sup>(144.2), grains/panicle (93.2) and 1000 grain weight (22.2 g). Rice grain yield (5.89 t/ha), straw yield (10.57 t/ha) and weed control efficiency (90.71%) was higher under two hand weeding done at 20 and 40 DAT which was followed by hand hoeing (5.52 and 10.4 t/ha, 87.9%). Among the different doses, chlorimuron-ethyl 12 g/ha recorded higher grain yield (5.4 t/ha), straw yield (10.6 t/ha) and weed control efficiency (85.5%). Due to higher cost of cultivation hand weeded plot recorded lowest B:C ratio (1.7). However, hand hoeing and chlorimuron-ethyl 12 g/ha recorded highest B:C ratio (3.1 and 3.0), which was found at par to each other.

#### SUMMARY

Chlorimuron-ethyl was found very effective to control broad-leaved weeds and sedges, however it was less effective on grassy weeds. Chlorimuron-ethyl 12 g/ha was found much effective than lower dose for controlling the existing weed flora with higher crop yield and benefit: cost ratio.

- Agricultural Statistics 2011. Agricultural Statistics at a Glance. Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Dubey MP, Tiwari UK, Kumarvanshi SM, Goswami SP and Singh R. 2000. Response of soybean and associate weed to pre emergence application of chlorimuron-ethyl and metalachlor. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **32** (3&2):153-155.
- Mukherjee PK, Anindya Sarkar and Maity SK. 2008. Critical period of crop-weed competition in transplanted and wet-seeded *kharif* rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) under tarai conditions. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **40**(3&4): 147-152.
- Soni Monika, Upadhyay VB and Singh Poonam. 2012. Weed dynamics and production efficiency of rice-based cropping system. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **44**(1): 21–25.

Indian Journal of Weed Science **45**(2): 137–139, 2013

# Pre- and post-emergence herbicides for integrated weed management in summer greengram

S.K. Chhodavadia\*, R.K Mathukiya and V.K. Dobariya

Department of Agronomy, Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh, Gujarat 362 001

Received: 7 March 2013; Revised: 18 April 2013

Key words : Greengram, Herbicide efficacy, Weed index, Yield attributes

Weed infestation is one of the major constraints in greengram cultivation. In view of severe infestation of annual and perennial weeds in summer greengram, the potential yield is generally not realized. The available preand post-emergence herbicide, pendimethalin, oxyfluorfen, fenaxaprop-p-ethyl and quizalofop-ethyl are able to check the emergence and growth of annual grasses and broadleaved weeds. This study was done to find out the relative efficiency of different herbicide when applied alone or in combination with cultural operation in summer greengram.

The experiment was carried out during summer season of 2011 at Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh (Gujarat). The soil of the experimental field was medium black soil having pH 8.10 and EC 0.49 dS/m. It was medium, low and high in available N, P and K, respectively. Summer greengram variety 'Greengram-4' was drilled at 20 kg/ha at 45 cm row spacing on February 18, 2011. The crop was grown with recommended package of practices except weed management. Ten treatment comprising inter-culture with weeding once (30 DAS), two inter-culture with weeding (20 DAS, 30 DAS, 40 DAS), pendimethalin 0.900 kg/ha, oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha, fenaxaprop-p-ethyl 0.075 kg/ha and quizalofop-ethyl 0.040 kg/ha and integration each of pendimethalin 0.900 kg/ha and oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha with an intercultural and weeding (30 DAS), weed free (weeding at 15, 30, 45 and 55 DAS) and unweeded control were tried in randomized block design with three replication. Inter-culturing operation was carried out in inter row space through bullock drawn implement and simultaneous removal of weeds manually in intra row space. All the herbicide were applied with manually operate knapsack sprayer fitted with flood jet nozzle at a spray volume of 500 l/ha. Weed count were recorded at 30 DAS , 60 DAS and at harvest and were subjected to  $\sqrt{x + 0.5}$  transformation, while dry weight of weeds was recorded at harvest.

\*Corresponding author: sunilchhodavadia@gmail.com

Experimental field was infested with *Panicum* colonum L., Cynodon dactylon L., Cyperus rotundus L., Digera arvensis Forsk, Euphorbia hirta L., Leucas aspera Spreng., Phyllanthus niruri L., Portulaca oleracea L. and Indigoflora glandulosa L.

All the herbicidal and integrated treatments significantly reduced the weed density and their biomass over weedy check. At 30, 60 DAS and harvest, least weed density and dry matter were observed in monocot, dicot and sedges at two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 and 40 DAS which was at par with oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ ha + 1 hand weeding at 30 DAS and pendimethalin 0.900 kg/ha + 1 hand weeding + inter-culturing at 30 DAS. Two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS showed its superiority by recording least weed density and their dry matter (Fig. 1). Although oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha + 1 hand weeding at 30 DAS was found equally good but their effectiveness could not match with two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS which may be due to the escape of some weed species. The excellent performance of two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS were due to better control of weeds which constituted more than 70% of the total weed flora.



Fig. 1 Effect of different treatments on dry weight of weed, weed index and weed control efficiency

The lowest dry weight of weed was found by the application of two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS and highest dry weight of weeds by pendimethalin 0.900 kg/ha. The lowest weed index (2.68%) and highest weed control efficiency (55.69%) was observed when two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS followed by oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha + 1 hand weeding at 30 DAS (4.68%, 51.58%, respectively). Among herbicides, quizalofop-ethyl (WCE 36.70%) was most effective in controlling weeds followed by fenoxaprop-p-ethyl (WCE 36.70%). The finding confirms the results of Bhandari *et al.* (2004) and Idapuganti *et al.* (2005).

There was vigorous growth of weed in unweeded check treatments resulted higher uptake of N, P and K nutrients. While treatment two hand weeding and two interculturing at 20 and 40 DAS recorded the least loss of nutrients by weeds followed by the oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ ha (Table 1). It can be explained in the light of the facts that these treatments controlled the weeds effectively, might have made more nutrients available to crop and consequently encouraged higher concentration of nutrients and more yield and there by higher uptake of nutrients by the crop. Two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS significantly increase protein content (22.2 %) followed by oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha + 1 hand weeding at 30 DAS (21.87 percent). This can be ascribed to better control of weeds by manual weeding and integration with herbicidal method as compared to unweeded condition, which might have increased uptake of nutrients and water.

The effect of integrated weed management was found significantly on yield attributed and seed yield significantly. Two hand weeding and two interculturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS and oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha + 1 hand weeding at 30 DAS applied for the depressed weed growth and promoted yield parameters and seed yield (Table 2). Plant height, branches/plant, no. of pods/plant, length of pod (cm), no. of grain/pod, grain weight/plant (g), test weight (g), grain yield (t/ha), stover yield (t/ha) increased significantly due to application of two hand weeding and two interculturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS and oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha+ 1 hand weeding at 30 DAS supplemented with post-emergence herbicide. Among herbicides, application of quizalofop-ethyl resulted in significantly higher grain yield over fenoxaprop-p-ethyl, oxyfluorfen and pendimethalin. The results are in close conformity with those reported by Kohli et al. (2006). Among the treatment, application of two hand weeding and two interculturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS produced highest grain and stover yield of 0.97 and 1.37 t/ha, respectively, and closely followed by oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha+ 1 HW at 30 DAS with seed and stover yield of 0.95 t/ha and 1.36 t/ha. However, both these treatments were at par with weed free treatment. Higher grain yield under integrated weed control treatments (herbicide + hand weeding + interculturing) may be attributed mainly to the better control of weeds during different stages, manual removal of weeds emerging, weeding and interculturing at subsequent stages, resulting in reduced crop-weed competition and thereby providing better yield attributes (Vivek et al. 2008).

|  | Dose    | Protein |      | Nut | rient upt | ake (kg/ | 'ha) |      |
|--|---------|---------|------|-----|-----------|----------|------|------|
| Treatment  | (kg/ha) | content | Crop |     |           | ,        |      |      |
|  |         | (%)     | Ν    | Р   | K         | N        | Р    | Κ    |
| T <sub>1</sub> - Pendimethalin   | 0.900   | 19.3    | 29.1 | 5.5 | 30.9      | 25.0     | 1.6  | 13.4 |
| T <sub>2</sub> - Pendimethalin +1 HW + IC at 30 DAS                          | 0.900   | 21.2    | 36.1 | 6.6 | 35.7      | 19.9     | 1.1  | 10.3 |
| T <sub>3</sub> - Oxyfluorfen   | 0.180   | 19.6    | 30.2 | 5.5 | 32.4      | 24.0     | 1.5  | 12.7 |
| $T_4$ - Oxyfluorfen + 1 HW at 30 DAS   | 0.180   | 21.8    | 37.7 | 7.0 | 36.2      | 19.1     | 1.0  | 10.0 |
| T <sub>5</sub> - Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl at 20 DAS                                | 0.075   | 20.2    | 31.7 | 5.8 | 33.0      | 23.6     | 1.4  | 11.8 |
| T <sub>6</sub> - Quizalofop-ethyl at 20 DAS                                  | 0.040   | 20.5    | 32.7 | 6.0 | 33.9      | 23.0     | 1.3  | 11.5 |
| T <sub>7</sub> - One hand weeding + and one<br>inter-culturing at 30 DAS     |         | 20.7    | 34.3 | 6.3 | 35.0      | 20.5     | 1.2  | 10.6 |
| T <sub>8</sub> - Two hand weeding + two inter-<br>culturing at 20 and 40 DAS |         | 22.1    | 38.0 | 7.4 | 37.6      | 16.9     | 0.9  | 9.4  |
| T <sub>9</sub> - Weed free   |         | 23.0    | 40.5 | 7.8 | 38.4      | 0.0      | 0.0  | 0.0  |
| T <sub>10</sub> - Unweeded check   |         | 18.2    | 24.9 | 4.7 | 31.0      | 28.7     | 1.9  | 15.1 |
| LSD (P=0.05)   |         | 2.6     | 3.8  | 0.2 | 2.2       | 3.85     | 0.27 | 2.20 |

Table 1. Effect of weed-control treatments on protein content and nutrient uptake by greengram and weeds

| Treatment             | Plant<br>height<br>(cm) | Branches<br>/plant | No. of<br>pods/<br>plant | Length<br>of pod<br>(cm) | No. of<br>grain/<br>pod | Grain<br>weight/<br>plant<br>(g) | Test<br>weight<br>(g) | Grain<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Stover<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Net<br>returns<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹<br>/ha) | Benefit:<br>cost<br>ratio |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| $T_1$                 | 26.2                    | 4.86               | 11.2                     | 5.5                      | 5.7                     | 5.1                              | 30.3                  | 0.76                     | 1.13                      | 12.92   | 2.09                      |
| $T_2$                 | 36.6                    | 6.13               | 14.6                     | 7.4                      | 6.7                     | 6.2                              | 35.3                  | 0.95                     | 1.36                      | 17.62   | 2.35                      |
| <b>T</b> <sub>3</sub> | 28.2                    | 5.00               | 12.1                     | 5.9                      | 5.9                     | 5.3                              | 32.1                  | 0.77                     | 1.17                      | 13.30   | 2.12                      |
| $T_4$                 | 37.2                    | 6.37               | 15.0                     | 7.8                      | 6.9                     | 6.8                              | 35.8                  | 0.95                     | 1.36                      | 18.04   | 2.41                      |
| T5                    | 31.2                    | 5.33               | 12.9                     | 6.4                      | 6.2                     | 5.6                              | 32.6                  | 0.80                     | 1.21                      | 14.43   | 2.26                      |
| T <sub>6</sub>        | 33.0                    | 5.47               | 13.2                     | 6.7                      | 6.2                     | 5.9                              | 33.4                  | 0.82                     | 1.26                      | 15.21   | 2.32                      |
| <b>T</b> 7            | 35.4                    | 5.80               | 13.2                     | 6.9                      | 6.5                     | 6.0                              | 34.6                  | 0.85                     | 1.30                      | 15.82   | 2.35                      |
| $T_8$                 | 39.3                    | 6.73               | 15.4                     | 8.1                      | 7.0                     | 6.9                              | 35.9                  | 0.97                     | 1.37                      | 18.35   | 2.41                      |
| T9                    | 40.1                    | 7.03               | 16.1                     | 8.6                      | 7.1                     | 7.5                              | 36.8                  | 1.00                     | 1.41                      | 18.42   | 2.33                      |
| T <sub>10</sub>       | 23.4                    | 4.50               | 10.2                     | 4.7                      | 5.3                     | 4.9                              | 29.1                  | 0.65                     | 1.06                      | 11.07   | 2.07                      |
| LSD (P=0.05)          | 3.7                     | 1.26               | 3.0                      | 1.0                      | NS                      | 1.1                              | 4.7                   | 0.14                     | 0.21                      | -   | -                         |

Table 2. Effect of weed-control treatments on growth, yield and economics of greengram

DAS= Day after sowing: Treatment details are given in Table 1

The highest net monetary returns of ₹18354/ha was obtained with two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS which was at par with oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha + 1 hand weeding at 30 DAS (18040/ha). The highest benefit: cost ratio of 2.41 was obtained with two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS and oxyfluorfen 0.180 kg/ha + 1 hand weeding at 30 DAS closely followed by pendimethalin 0.900 kg/ha + 1 hand weeding + inter-culturing at 30 DAS and one hand weeding and one inter-culturing at 30 DAS which may be due to lower cost of treatments than other. It was concluded that application of two hand weeding and two inter-culturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS were found effective to control weeds and to improve crop yield. These findings were in close vicinity with those reported by Sardana et al. (2006). Thus, chemical weed control with oxyfuorfen as pre-emergence in summer greengram was found economically viable.

#### SUMMARY

A field experiment was carried out on the medium black soil of Junagadh Agricultural University, Junagadh (Gujarat) during summer season of 2011. The relative efficacy of pendimethalin, oxyfluorfen, fenoxaprop-pethyl, quizalofop-ethyl was tested applied alone or in combination with hand weeding and intercultural 30 days after sowing (DAS) to control weeds in summer green-gram. Two hand weeding with two interculturing at 20 DAS and 40 DAS proved its superiority over rest of the weed management in summer green gram. Among herbicidal treatment, application of quizalofop-ethyl at 20 DAS and fenoxaprop-p-ethyl at 20 DAS was found to be relatively more effective in controlling weeds than their sole application.

- Bhandari V, Singh B, Randhawa JS and Singh J. 2004. Relative efficacy and economics of integrated weed management in blackgram under semi-humid climate of Punjab. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **36**(3&4): 276-277.
- Idapuganti RG, Rana DS and Sharma R. 2005. Influence of integrated weed management on weed control and productivity of soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merrill). *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 37(1-2): 126-128.
- Kohli S, Nehra DS and Satbir Singh. 2006. Quality and economics of mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.) as influenced by weed management practices. *Research on Crops* **7**(3): 664-665.
- Sardana V, Singh S and Sheoran P. 2006. Efficacy and economics of weed management practices in blackgram (*Vigna mungo* L.) under rainfed conditions. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 38(1&2): 77-80.
- Vivek NS, Rana Raghuvir Singh and Tomar SS. 2008. Effect of weed interference on weeds and productivity of blackgram (*Phaseolus mugo*). *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **40** (1&2): 65-67.

**Short communication** 



# Early post-emergence herbicides for weed control in soybean

C. Sangeetha\*, C. Chinnusamy and N.K. Prabhakaran

Department of Agronomy, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu 641 003

Received: 20 February 2013; Revised: 31 May 2013

Key words: Early post-emergence, Economics, Soybean, Weed control efficiency, Yield

Soybean (Glycine max (L.) Merill) plays an important role in boosting oilseed production in the country. It stands second, among the nine oilseed crops, next only to groundnut in production in the country. It has outstanding nutritive value with 43% biological protein, 20% oil and is also very rich in vitamins, iron, mineral, salts and aminoacids. India is having soybean area of 9.52 million ha with a total production of 9.90 million tonnes and a productivity of 1.0 t/ha (DAC, Govt of India 2009). However, its productivity is low as compared to potential yield due to infestation of weeds. Weeds are the foremost biotic constraints in enhancing productivity of soybean and take yield toll ranging from 20 to 89% (Chhokar and Balyan 1999, Dubey 2002). Though the conventional method (hand weeding) of weed control is very effective, but due to high wages and non-availability of labour during the critical weeding period, the use of herbicides could be more effective and time saving. Therefore, this study was conducted on weed management in soybean grown in western zone of Tamil Nadu to find out agro-economic feasibility and its impact on grain yield.

A field experiment was carried out during Kharif seasons of 2009 at Agricultural Research Station, Bhavanisagar, Tamil Nadu. The soil was red sandy loam having pH 6.72, EC 0.18 dS/m, OC 0.55%, available N, P, K 230, 20, 268 kg/ha, respectively. The treatments comprised of imazethapyr 50, 75, 100 and 200 at g/ha as early post-emergence (EPOE) sprayed 15 days after sowing, oxyfluorfen 125 g/ha and pendimethalin 750 g/ha as preemergence (PE) were sprayed at 3 days after sowing, hand weedings at 25 and 45 days after sowing (DAS) and unweeded check (control) (T<sub>8</sub>). All these treatments for comparison, except unweeded check were given with an earthing up at 45 DAS. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with three replications. All the herbicides were applied by manually operated knapsack sprayer fitted with flat fan nozzle using spray volume of 500 l/ha. The density and dry weight of weeds were recorded at 30 and 60 DAS. Soybean variety 'CO (Soy) 3'

was sown in 30 cm wide rows. The crop was fertilized with 20 kg N + 80 kg P + 40 kg K/ha. Economics was worked out on the basis of prevailing market prices.

Dactyloctenium aegyptium, Acrachne racemosa and Bracharia reptans, were the dominant grass weeds. Cyperus rotundus was the only sedge present. The predominant broad-leaved weeds were Boerhavia diffusa, Digera arvensis, Parthenium hysterophorous and Trichodesma indicum. The investigations carried out by Balusamy et al. (1996) at Coimbatore showed that Trianthema portulacastrum, Amaranthus viridis, Parthenium hysterophorus, Echinochloa sp. and Cyperus sp. were dominant weeds of soybean.

All the herbicidal treatments significantly reduced the weed density and weed dry weight over unweeded control (Table 1). Significantly lower dry weed weight was recorded with hand weeding on 25 and 45 DAS. Among the herbicides, EPOE imazethapyr at 100 g/ha and EPOE imazethapyr 200 g/ha recorded significantly lesser weed dry weight than other herbicides at both the stages. Similar results were reported by Chandel and Saxena (2001), where POE imazethapyr at 100 g/ha was found to be effective in controlling weeds at various stages. At 30 and 60 DAS, early post- emergence application of imazethapyr had more pronounced effect in reducing the weed density and weed dry weight as compared to oxyfluorfen 125 g/ ha and pendimethalin 750 g/ha application. EPOE imazethapyr 200 g/ha or EPOE imazethapyr 100 g/ha was effective against both dicot and monocot weeds and were at par with two hand weedings. Better performance of imazethapyr in the present study appeared to be due to better control of broad-leaved weeds as well as grassy weeds. The weed control efficiency could be enhanced (77-91%) and (93-98%) due to higher dose of imazethapyr at 30 and 60 DAS, respectively.

Seed yield was significantly influenced by different weed control treatments. Among the treatments, EPOE imazethapyr 100 g/ha recorded significantly higher seed yield followed by EPOE imazethapyr at 200 g/ha which was on par with PE pendimethalin 750 g/ha and PE

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: chandrusan2007@gmail.com

| Treatment                  |              | ed density<br>/m <sup>2</sup> ) | Total weed of (kg/h |              | Weed control efficiency<br>(%) |        |
|----------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------|
|                            | 30 DAS       | 60 DAS                          | 30 DAS              | 60 DAS       | 30 DAS                         | 60 DAS |
| Iimazethapyr 50 g /ha EPOE | 2.45 (278.7) | 1.75 (55.7)                     | 1.80 (61.7)         | 1.30 (18.4)  | 77.7                           | 93.1   |
| Imazethapyr 75 g /ha EPOE  | 2.34 (223.3) | 1.70 (51.0)                     | 1.72 (50.8)         | 1.19 (13.8)  | 81.6                           | 94.8   |
| Imazethapyr 100 g /ha EPOE | 2.06 (114.6) | 1.45(28.3)                      | 1.54 (33.9)         | 1.02 (8.58)  | 87.7                           | 96.8   |
| Imazethapyr 200 g /ha EPOE | 1.93 (85.0)  | 1.33 (1967)                     | 1.40 (24.6)         | 0.85 (5.11)  | 91.1                           | 98.1   |
| Oxyfluorfen 125 g /ha PE   | 2.29 (191.3) | 1.82 (65.67)                    | 1.75 (55.3)         | 1.40 (16.4)  | 80.0                           | 93.8   |
| Pendimethalin 750 g/ha PE  | 2.19 (154.0) | 1.82 (65.7)                     | 1.71 (54.5)         | 1.18 (13.1)  | 80.3                           | 94.4   |
| HW on 25 and 45 DAS        | 1.54 (34.3)  | 2.24 (175.0)                    | 1.72 (51.45)        | 2.30 (199.8) | 81.4                           | 53.5   |
| Unweeded control           | 2.97 (925.3) | 2.70 (506.3)                    | 2.44 (276.3)        | 2.56 (369.4) | -                              | -      |
| LSD (P=0.05)               | 0.18         | 0.22                            | 0.16                | 0.22         | NA                             | NA     |

Table 1. Effect of weed management on weed density, dry weight and weed control efficiency in soybean

Values in parentheses are original values; EPOE- Early post-emergence, PE- Pre-emergence, NA- Not analysed

| Table 2. Effect of | weed | management | on         | productivity | ' and | economics in sovbean |
|--------------------|------|------------|------------|--------------|-------|----------------------|
| Table 2. Lifect of | necu | management | <b>UII</b> | productivity | anu   | conomics in soy beam |

| Treatment                 | Seed yield<br>(t/ha) | Stover yield<br>(t/ha) | Cost of cultivation<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | Gross returns<br>(x10³₹/ha) | Net returns (x10³₹/ha) | B:C<br>ratio |
|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Imazethapyr 50 g/ha EPOE  | 1.39                 | 2.24                   | 15.37  | 28.04                       | 12.66                  | 1.82         |
| Imazethapyr 75 g/ha EPOE  | 1.47                 | 2.39                   | 15.50  | 30.99                       | 15.49                  | 1.99         |
| Imazethapyr 100 g/ha EPOE | 1.64                 | 2.67                   | 15.62  | 34.65                       | 19.03                  | 2.21         |
| Imazethapyr 200 g/ha EPOE | 1.51                 | 2.85                   | 16.12  | 34.10                       | 17.98                  | 2.14         |
| Oxyfluorfen 125 g/ha PE   | 1.30                 | 2.49                   | 15.28  | 29.03                       | 13.74                  | 1.89         |
| Pendimethalin 750 g/ha PE | 1.48                 | 2.25                   | 15.90  | 31.23                       | 15.33                  | 1.96         |
| HW on 25 and 45 DAS       | 1.23                 | 2.03                   | 17.12  | 26.65                       | 9.57                   | 1.56         |
| Unweeded control          | 0.83                 | 1.47                   | 13.62  | 19.62                       | 5.99                   | 1.43         |
| LSD (P=0.05)              | 0.09                 | 0.09                   | NA   | NA                          | NA                     | NA           |

oxyfluorfen 125 g/ha. The results are in corroboration with the findings of Kushwah and Vyas (2006) who have observed that the application of imazethapyr has increased the seed yield of soybean. However, EPOE imazethapyr 200 g/ha had phytotoxicity effect on soybean at initial stages causing stunted growth and chlorosis and get recovered after one or two irrigation.

EPOE imazethapyr at 100 g/ha recorded the highest gross return ( $\overline{<}$  34,654), net returns ( $\overline{<}$  19029) and B:C ratio (2.21) (Table 2.). As the cost of the treatment was lower with EPOE application of imazethapyr at 100 g/ha than hand weeding, it registered the additional return followed by EPOE application of imazethapyr 200 g/ha. The increased additional income realized with these two treatments might be due to higher seed yield obtained due to the treatment efficiency which would have reduced the competition between weeds and crop for water and nutrients. Similar results were reported by Kumar and Das (2008) by application of imazethapyr which had better control over weeds and acquired highest benefit cost ratio and net returns. Thus, herbicidal weed management using early postemergence imazethapyr at 100 g/ha followed by earthing up on 45 DAS might be the best method to control majority of weeds, obtaining higher productivity of soybean with better economic returns.

## SUMMARY

A field experiment was conducted during *Kharif* 2009 to evaluate the economic feasibility of weed management practices in soybean (*Glycine max*) grown in red loamy soils of western zone of Tamil Nadu. Early post- emergence (EPOE) application of imazethapyr reduced the density and dry biomass of broad-leaved weeds as well as grasses significantly as compared to pre-emergence herbicide under study. The lowest weed density and biomass were recorded with hand weedings twice on 30 days after sowing (DAS) followed by imazethapyr at 200 and 100 g/ha. Imazethapyr at 100 g/ha was found to be the economic method of weed management by giving higher net returns with grain yield.

- Balusamy M, Ravichandran VC and Balasubramaniam N. 1996. Herbicide selectivity and weed control in soybean. *Madras Agricultural Journal* **83**(8): 523-524.
- Chandel AS and Saxena SC. 2001. Effect of some new post-emergence herbicides on weed parameters and seed yield of soybean (*Glycine max*). *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **46**(2): 332-338.
- Chhokar RS and Balyan RS. 1999. Competition and control of weeds in soybean. *Soybean Abstract* **22**: 71.
- DAC (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation), Govt of India, 2009. www.tn.gov.in
- Dubey MP. 2002. Bio-efficacy and phytotoxicity evaluation of anilophos (5G and 30 EC) and metalachlor (50 EC) in soybean [*Glycine max* (L.) Merrill]. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 34: 53-54.
- Kumar M and Das TK. 2008. Integrated weed management for system productivity and economics in soybean (*Glycine max*)– wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) system. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **53**(3): 189–194.
- Kushwah SS and Vyas MD. 2006. Efficacy of herbicides against weeds in rainfed soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merrill) under Vindhyan plateau of Madhya Pradesh. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 38(1&2): 62-64.

**Short communication** 



# Weed management in irrigated organic finger millet

Basavaraj Patil\*, V.C. Reddy, T.V. Ramachandra Prasad, B.C. Shankaralingappa, R. Devendra and K.N. Kalyanamurthy

Department of Agronomy, University of Agricultural Acience GKVK, Bangalore, Karnataka 560 065

Received: 27 March 2013; Revised: 20 May 2013

Key words: Inter-cultivation, Organic, Stale seedbed, Weed control efficiency, Weed index

Finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn.) ranks third in importance among millets in the country in both area (1.27 million ha) and production (1.91 million tonnes) after sorghum and pearl millet. It is commonly referred as ragi in Karnataka. It is one of the major staple foods of farming communities of southern Karnataka. Apart from human consumption, straw is also used as fodder for cattle and green straw is suitable for making silage.

Organic farming is being practiced in more than 130 countries of the world with a total area of 30.4 m ha (0.65% of the total agricultural land) with 0.7 million number of organic farmers world over (Willer 2008). It is gaining momentum in India owing to the concerns expressed on the safety of environment, soil, water and food chain. Cultivating crops organically, and at the same time maintaining higher production levels is a big challenge. Since chemical intervention is not permitted for weed management, non chemical weed management is the major limitation in field crops like ragi, paddy and other cereals under organic farming. A concern about the potential increase in weed population due to non use of herbicides is rated as serious problem in organic farming (Bond and Grundy 2001). Weeding through non-chemical means have to be undertaken within the critical period of the crop. Hence, the present study was initiated to find out effective and economical weed management practices in organic finger millet.

The field experiment was conducted during *Kharif* 2012 at the Main Research Station, Hebbal, Bengaluru, to identify the suitable methods of managing weeds in organic finger millet. It was laid out in randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replications. The soil of the experimental field was sandy loam having pH of 6.55 with 236 kg N, 27.2 kg  $P_2O_5$  and 176.2 kg  $K_2O$ /ha. The variety used for the experiment was '*GPU-28*'. The experiment comprised of twelve treatments, *viz.* T<sub>1</sub>- passing wheel hoe at 20, 30 and 40 DAP, T<sub>2</sub>- inter-cultivation

\*Corresponding author: bspatil4504@gmail.com

twice at 20 and 35 DAP,  $T_{3^-}$  stale seedbed technique,  $T_{4^-}$  passing wheel hoe at 20, 30 and 40 DAP + one hand weeding at 45 DAP,  $T_{5^-}$  inter-cultivation twice at 20 and 35 DAP + one hand weeding at 45 DAP,  $T_{6^-}$  stale seedbed technique + inter cultivation twice at 20 and 35 DAP,  $T_{7^-}$  organic mulching 10 t/ha after transplanting,  $T_{8^-}$  growing cover crops (horse gram/cowpea) and mulching at 55 DAP,  $T_{9^-}$  directed spray of *Eucalyptus* leaf extract on weeds,  $T_{10^-}$  directed spray of cattle urine on weeds,  $T_{11^-}$  hand weeding twice at 20 and 30 DAP,  $T_{12^-}$  unweeded check.

Seedlings were raised in nursery bed of size 7.5 m long, 1.2 m width and 10 cm height prepared one month before transplanting of the crop. Nursery bed was prepared and the FYM was mixed with soil. Seeds 5 kg/ha were sown uniformly and light irrigation was given periodically. Neem cake was applied equivalent to 50 kg N/ha at the time of transplanting. Cattle urine was top dressed in three splits at 15, 30 and 40 DAP to meet remaining 50 kg N/ha. Stale seedbed treatment was initiated 15 days before transplanting of the crop. One irrigation was given to stale seedbed plots and weeds were allowed to germinate. The germinated weeds were removed by passing cultivator criscross one day before transplanting of the crop. Organic mulching was done with crop residues (paddy straw) and dried grasses 10 t/ha one week after transplanting. Seed mixture of cowpea and horse gram was sown in between two rows of finger millet. These cover crops were mulched between rows at 55 DAP.

Major weed flora observed in the experimental plot were: Cyperus rotundus L. among sedges; Echinochloa colona (L.), Cynodon dactylon (L.) Pers, Dactyloctenium aegyptium (L.) Beauv., Digitaria marginata (Retz.), Eragrostis pilosa (at initial stage) Eleusine indica (L.) Gaertn, (at later stages) among grasses; among broadleaved weeds Parthenium hysterophorus, Alternanthera sessilis, Sida acuta, Spillanthus acmella, Commelina benghalensis, Ageratum conyzoides, Ocimum canum, Cinebra didema. etc. Similar findings have been reported by Kumar (2004).

At 60 DAP, the total weed density and weed dry weight was significantly lower in hand weeding twice at 20 and 30 DAP (26.32 and 6.4  $g/m^2$ ) treatment and was on par with stale seed bed technique + inter-cultivation twice at 20 and 35 DAP (29.67 and 8.0 g/m<sup>2</sup>) and  $T_1$  + one hand weeding (41.26 and 10.7 g/m<sup>2</sup>). Whereas, stale seedbed alone and spray of cattle urine on weeds were not significantly controled the total weed density, which were on par with unweeded control (279.68 and 95.1 g/m<sup>2</sup>, respectively). At harvest, total weed density and weed dry weight was significantly lower in hand weeding twice at 20 and 30 DAP (22.60 and 9.4 g/m<sup>2</sup>, respectively) and was at par with stale seedbed technique + inter cultivation twice at 20 and 35 DAP (23.90 and 10.3 g/m<sup>2</sup>, respectively). All the weed management treatments recorded significantly lower total weed density at harvest except stale seedbed

Table 1. Total weed density and weed dry weight atdifferent stages in finger millet as influencedby weed management practices

|                 | Weed of (no./ |         | Weed dr<br>(g/1 |         |
|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| Treatment       | 60<br>DAP     | Harvest | 60<br>DAP       | Harvest |
| $T_1$           | 1.72          | 1.68    | 1.62            | 1.67    |
|                 | (50.2)        | (46.4)  | (39.7)          | (44.7)  |
| $T_2$           | 1.92          | 1.79    | 1.76            | 1.76    |
|                 | (80.9)        | (59.0)  | (55.8)          | (55.7)  |
| T <sub>3</sub>  | 2.25          | 2.23    | 1.91            | 1.96    |
|                 | (177.5)       | (166.8) | (80.0)          | (89.9)  |
| $T_4$           | 1.64          | 1.64    | 1.10            | 1.55    |
|                 | (41.2)        | (41.8)  | (10.7)          | (33.3)  |
| T5              | 1.69          | 1.68    | 1.65            | 1.63    |
|                 | (47.3)        | (45.5)  | (42.9)          | (40.6)  |
| $T_6$           | 1.50          | 1.41    | 1.00            | 1.09    |
|                 | (29.6)        | (23.9)  | (8.0)           | (10.3)  |
| T7              | 2.10          | 2.04    | 1.74            | 1.78    |
|                 | (124.0)       | (108.5) | (52.4)          | (58.4)  |
| $T_8$           | 1.89          | 1.83    | 1.74            | 1.67    |
|                 | (76.0)        | (65.1)  | (53.5)          | (44.3)  |
| T9              | 2.22          | 2.18    | 1.92            | 1.94    |
|                 | (165.5)       | (149.5) | (81.3)          | (86.0)  |
| T10             | 2.27          | 2.21    | 1.84            | 1.93    |
|                 | (185.8)       | (160.0) | (67.7)          | (82.2)  |
| T <sub>11</sub> | 1.45          | 1.39    | 0.92            | 1.06    |
|                 | (26.3)        | (22.6)  | (6.4)           | (9.4)   |
| T <sub>12</sub> | 2.45          | 2.39    | 1.99            | 2.03    |
|                 | (279.6)       | (245.9) | (95.1)          | (105.1) |
| LSD (P=0.05)    | 0.20          | 0.19    | 0.06            | 0.11    |

Figures in parentheses are original values; data analyzed using transformation  $=\log (x+2)$ ; Treatment details are given in materials and methods

technique alone and spray of cattle urine on weeds which were at par with unweeded control (245.90 and 105.1 g/  $m^2$ , respectively).

The WCE was higher with hand weeding twice at different growth stage of the crop (92.8, 93.2 and 91.0 % at 30, 60 DAP and at harvest, respectively) owing to the fact that it produced lesser weed dry weight. Similar findings were observed by Kumar (2004) in groundnut-finger millet cropping system, who observed hand weeding twice to be the best treatment having the lowest WI, highest WCE and higher yield. WCE of stale seedbed technique combined with inter cultivation twice (91.3, 91.6 and 90.1% at 30, 60 DAP and at harvest respectively) and passing wheel hoe at 20, 30 and 45 DAP with one hand weeding (68.5, 88.7 and 68.3% at 30, 60 DAP and at harvest, respectively,). The results of this study were similar with earlier findings of Ramamoorthy et al. (2009) in finger millet and Sindhu et al. (2010) in wet seeded rice. Similar findings were also obtained by Mynavathi et al. (2008) in irrigated maize and found that passing wheel hoe significantly reduced the weed dry weight and increased the maize yield compared to other mechanical weeders.

Grain yield of finger millet was significantly higher in hand weeding twice at 20 and 30 DAP (5.46 t/ha) as compared to unweeded control. However, it was on par with stale seedbed technique + inter cultivation twice and also with passing wheel hoe at 20, 30 and 45 DAP + one hand weeding (5.36 t/ha). Similar findings were obtained by Ramamoorthy *et al.* (2009). This higher yield might be

Table 2. Weed control efficiency (%) at different<br/>growth stages and grain yield of finger millet<br/>as influenced by weed management practices

|                 |        | WCE    |         | Grain           |  |  |
|-----------------|--------|--------|---------|-----------------|--|--|
| Treatment       | 30 DAP | 60 DAP | Harvest | yield<br>(t/ha) |  |  |
| $T_1$           | 33.0   | 58.2   | 57.5    | 4.09            |  |  |
| $T_2$           | 18.6   | 41.3   | 47.0    | 3.93            |  |  |
| T3              | 26.6   | 15.8   | 14.4    | 3.39            |  |  |
| $T_4$           | 68.5   | 88.7   | 68.3    | 5.14            |  |  |
| T5              | 31.5   | 54.9   | 61.3    | 4.22            |  |  |
| T <sub>6</sub>  | 91.3   | 91.6   | 90.1    | 5.36            |  |  |
| T7              | 84.4   | 45.2   | 44.4    | 3.77            |  |  |
| $T_8$           | 8.5    | 43.7   | 57.8    | 3.20            |  |  |
| T9              | 12.5   | 14.5   | 18.1    | 2.92            |  |  |
| T <sub>10</sub> | 18.5   | 28.8   | 21.8    | 3.30            |  |  |
| T <sub>11</sub> | 92.8   | 93.2   | 91.0    | 5.46            |  |  |
| T <sub>12</sub> | 0.0    | 0.0    | 0.0     | 2.73            |  |  |
| LSD(P=0.05)     | -      | -      | -       | 0.95            |  |  |

due to better control of weeds at tillering stage of the crop resulted in higher yield of the crop. Whereas, lower grain yield (2.73 t/ha) was obtained in unweeded control. This reduction in yield might be due to highest competition with the finger millet throughout the crop growth period.

#### **SUMMARY**

A field experiment was conducted during Kharif season 2012 at the Main Research Station, Hebbal, Bengaluru, to know the effect of weed management practices on weed flora and weed growth in irrigated organic finger millet. All weed management treatments had significantly lower total weed density and weed dry weight as compared to unweeded control. Stale seed bed technique + inter cultivation twice at 20 and 35 DAP  $(23.9/m^2 \text{ and } 10.3 \text{ g/m}^2)$ significantly lowered the total weed density as well as weed dry weight and was at par with hand weeding twice at 20 and 30 DAP (22.6/m<sup>2</sup> and 9.4 g/m<sup>2</sup>, respectively). Higher total weed density and weed dry weight was found in unweeded check ( $245.9/m^2$  and  $105.1 g/m^2$ ). Highest weed control efficiency was found in manual weeding (93.2%) followed by stale seedbed combined with inter cultivation twice (91.6%) and passing wheel hoe twice with one manual weeding (88.7%). Grain yield was significantly higher in hand weeding twice (5.46 t/ha) followed by stale seedbed combined with inter cultivation twice (5.36 t/ha).

- Bond W and Grundy AC. 2001. Non-chemical weed management in organic farming systems. *Weed Research* **41**(5): 383-405.
- Kumar O. 2004. Weed management in transplanted finger milletgroundnut cropping system. Ph.D thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore, p. 80.
- Mynavathi VS, Prabhakaran NK and Chinnusamy C. 2008. Evaluation of mechanical weeders in irrigated maize. *Indian Journal* of Weed Science **40**(3&4): 210-213.
- Ramamoorthy K, Radhamani S and Subbain P. 2009. Integrated weed management for the control of *Trianthema portulacastrum* L. in rainfed finger millet (*Eleusine coracana* (L.) Gaertn). *Green Farming* 2(4): 221-223.
- Sindhu PV, George Thomas C and Abraham CT. 2010. Seedbed manipulation for weed management in wet seeded rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **42**(3&4): 173-179.
- Willer H. 2008. Organic agriculture worldwide- current statistics. In: World of Organic Agriculture–Statistics and Emerging Trends. IFOAM.

**Short communication** 



# Field demonstration of integrated weed managment in sorghum

A.S. Jadhav\*

AICRP on Weed Control, Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Krishi Vidyapeeth, Parbhani, Maharashtra 431 402

Received: 11 January 2013; Revised: 4 Ferbuary 2013

Key words: Field demonstration, Integrated weed managment, Sorghum, Yield

Sorghum is an important cereal crop grown on 8.47 lakh ha area with 9.85 lakh tonnes production in Maharashtra. The average productivity of sorghum in state is 1.16 t/ha. The crop is a good source of fodder for animals. The sorghum is a sturdy crop grows well in semi arid climate and gives better yields even with frequent dry spells occurring in a growing season.

One of the most important constraints in low productivity of sorghum is the weed infestation. The sorghum yields reduced to the tune of 60-70% due to weed infestation (Shelke 1995). Manual weeding alone is expensive, tedious and time consuming (Rajput and Khushwah 2005). Therefore, recommended integrated weed management practice was demonstrated at farmers field to show the practicability with higher yields over farmers practice.

Demonstrations were conducted during *Kharif* season of 2010-2012 in sorghum with recommended IWM that is application of pre-emergence atrazine 1.0 kg/ha followed by one hand weeding and hoeing at 6 weeks after sowing (Jadhav 2010) at randomly selected fifteen villages of Parbhani, Nanded, Beed, Hingoli and Jalna districts. Total fifteen farmers were selected for conducting demonstrations on their fields. The data were recorded from each farmer's field. The IWM was advised to undertake and the yields under farmers practice was also recorded at the same time for comparison.

The performance of IWM was recorded at demonstration at farmers field to show its effectiveness against weed growth and yield of sorghum. The fields under demonstrations were infested with *Euphorbia geniculata*, *Digera arvensis*, *Cyperus rotundus*, *Cynodon dactylon* and *Parthenium hysterophorus*.

IWM under all demonstrations was effective in reducing weed growth at different locations (Table 1). Farmers practice gave higher weed count and dry matter as compared to IWM treated plots at all the locations. The IWM in all demonstrations resulted on an average 27.4% increase in yield over farmers practice. The lowest in-

\*Corresponding author: asjadhav31@rediffmail.com

| Table 1. Performence | of IWM | in sorghum | at farmers |
|----------------------|--------|------------|------------|
| field                |        |            |            |

| neiu          |                |                |       |                |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Treatment and | $\mathbf{S}_1$ | $\mathbf{S}_2$ | $S_3$ | $\mathbf{S}_4$ |
| location      | ~1             |                | -     | ~ 1            |
| IWM           |                | _              | 2010  |                |
| Parbhani      | 28             | 13             | 1.90  | 26.7           |
| Nanded        | 19             | 10             | 2.10  | 31.1           |
| Beed          | 32             | 19             | 2.00  | 33.3           |
| Hingoli       | 18             | 16             | 1.80  | 50.0           |
| Jalna         | 07             | 14             | 2.20  | 29.4           |
| Mean          |                |                | 2.00  | 34.1           |
| FP            |                |                |       |                |
| Parbhani      | 116            | 27             | 1.50  |                |
| Nanded        | 96             | 25             | 1.60  |                |
| Beed          | 187            | 35             | 1.50  |                |
| Hingoli       | 152            | 32             | 1.20  |                |
| Jalna         | 148            | 31             | 1.70  |                |
| Mean          |                |                | 1.50  |                |
| IWM           |                | 2              | 011   |                |
| Parbhani      | 32             | 12             | 1.80  | 28.6           |
| Nanded        | 35             | 10             | 2.00  | 25.0           |
| Beed          | 46             | 18             | 1.85  | 19.3           |
| Hingoli       | 60             | 13             | 2.01  | 37.7           |
| Jalna         | 52             | 14             | 1.95  | 18.2           |
| Mean          |                |                | 1.92  | 25.4           |
| FP            |                |                |       |                |
| Parbhani      | 86             | 20             | 1.40  |                |
| Nanded        | 106            | 18             | 1.60  |                |
| Beed          | 118            | 25             | 1.55  |                |
| Hingoli       | 110            | 23             | 1.46  |                |
| Jalna         | 157            | 19             | 1.65  |                |
| Mean          |                |                |       |                |
| IWM           |                | 2              | 2012  |                |
| Parbhani      | 34             | 14             | 1.48  | 21.8           |
| Nanded        | 25             | 12             | 1.58  | 18.1           |
| Beed          | 62             | 22             | 1.28  | 21.9           |
| Hingoli       | 44             | 16             | 1.31  | 21.3           |
| Jalna         | 36             | 14             | 1.49  | 30.6           |
| Mean          | 50             | 11             | 1.43  | 22.7           |
| FP            |                |                | 1.45  | 22.1           |
| Parbhani      | 118            | 18             | 1.22  |                |
| Nanded        | 120            | 18             | 1.22  |                |
| Beed          | 120            | 26             | 1.05  |                |
| Hingoli       | 122            | 20<br>26       | 1.03  |                |
| Jalna         | 112            | 20             | 1.03  |                |
| Mean          | 112            |                | 1.14  |                |
| Meall         |                |                | 1.10  |                |

 $S_1$  - Weed count (no./m<sup>2</sup>) at 30 DAS;  $S_2$  - Weed dry matter (g/m<sup>2</sup>) at 30 DAS;  $S_3$  - Grain yield (t/ha);  $S_4$  - % increase over farmer's practice (FP)

crease in sorghum yield was 18.1%, where as highest increase in yield was 50%. It clearly indicated that if IWM is followed yield can be increased significantly. The demonstrations at farmers' field played an important role to disseminate the recommended IWM.

#### SUMMARY

Fifteen demonstrations on integrated weed managment technology were laid out during *Kharif* 2010 to 2012 in sorghum at randomly selected farmers field from various districts of Marathwada region of Maharashtra with an objective to show the performance of IWM in sorghum. The IWM was found effective in increasing grain yield of sorghum from 18-50% over farmers practice depending upon weed intensity.

- Jadhav AS. 2010 . Weed control Research Achievements. *MKV SS* Bulletin **2**, 6 p.
- Rajput RL and Kushwaha SS. 2005. Integrated weed management in soybean on farmers' field. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 36(3&4): 210-212.
- Shelke DK. 1995. Managing weeds in Maharashtra . *Indian Farming* **45**(5): 27-29.



# Integrated weed management in berseem

S.H. Pathan\*, A.B. Kamble and M.G. Gavit

Department of Agronomy, Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth, Rahuri, Maharashtra 413 722

Received: 7 January 2013; Revised: 19 May 2013

Key words: Berseem, Integrated weed managment, Seed yield, Weed dry weight, Weed intensity

Berseem or Egyptian clover (*Trifolium alexandrinum* L.), a potential winter forage legume, is one of the most popular crops in north, north-west and central parts of India. Because of its slow growth in the initial stages, crop suffers heavily due to weed infestation. Weeds particularly *Cichorium intybus* found associated with berseem and give more competitional stress by robbing the crop of essential nutrients, light, moisture and space (Thakur *et al.* 1990). Weed competition reduces the green forage yield up to 30-40% besides deteriorating quality of green forage (Jain 1998). The present investigation was undertaken to evaluate the bioefficacy of herbicide alone or in combination with mechanical methods in berseem.

An experiment was conducted at MPKV, Rahuri situated between 19° 48' and 19° 49' N latitude and between 74° 32' E and 76° 19' E longitude during *Rabi* season 2011-12. The altitude varied from 395 to 565 m above mean sea level. The soils of the experimental field were clayey in texture, low in available nitrogen (201.4 kg/ha), medium in available phosphorus (18.4 kg/ha) and high in available potassium (495 kg/ha). It was moderately alkaline in reaction (pH 8.01) with 0.23 dS/m electrical conductivity. The organic carbon content was 0.38 per cent.

The experiment consisting of 10 treatments (Table 1) was laid out in a randomized block design replicated thrice. The gross and net plot size employed was 4.0 x 3.0 m and 3.4 x 2.4 m, respectively. The maximum and minimum temperature during the crop growth period was ranging from 29.1-33.8°C and 10.1-15.9°C, respectively. Herbicides were sprayed with the manually operated knapsack sprayer fitted with flat-fan nozzle at spray volume of 500 l/ha. The pre-emergence herbicides were sprayed 3 days after sowing prior to emergence of weed The crop was fertilized with the recommended dose of fertilizer, 20 kg N, 80 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and 40 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha. The variety 'Wardan' was sown at 30 cm apart by using seed rate of 30 kg/ha. First two cuts were taken for green forage purpose there after crop was left for seed production purpose and harvesting of seed was done in the month of May. From each plot, 250 g representative fresh plant sample was taken in

\*Corresponding author: pathansarfraj85@gmail.com

each cut to estimate the dry matter content for computing dry matter yield of fodder. The weed density and its dry weight were recorded from each plot by using a quadrate method  $(1.0 \times 1.0 \text{ m})$  at harvest of last cut for seed. The weed control efficiency (WCE) and weed index (WI) was calculated as per the standard formula suggested by Gautam *et al.* (1975) and Gill and Vijaykumar (1969), respectively.

Major monocot weeds were: Cynodon dactylon (28.5%), Chloris barbata (7.1%), Digitaria longiflora (10.7%), Dactylocteium aegyptium (10.7%) and Cyperus rotundus (42.9%). Major dicot weeds were: Amaranthus viridis (16.7%), Euphorbia geniculata (8.3%), Celosia argentia (4.2%), Trianthema portulacastrum (4.2%), Commelina benghalensis (12.5%), Corchorus aestuans (4.2%), Parthenium hysterophorus (33.3%), Tridax procumbent (4.2%), Portulaca oleracea (4.2%), Cichorium intybus (4.2%). Out of these, P. hysterophorus E. geniculata, and C. rotundus were most dominated weeds.

Weedy check recorded significantly higher total weed density at harvest (51.8/m<sup>2</sup>). Significantly minimum weed count at harvest was found with weed free treatment followed by oxyflourfen 0.10 kg/ha as pre-emergence (PE) and imazethapyr 0.10 kg/ha as post-emergence (PoE), immediately after I<sup>st</sup> cut and it was found at par with one hoeing at 3 week after sowing and one hand weeding at 5 week after sowing (Table 1).

The minimum weed dry weight at harvest was observed under weed free check which was followed by treatment oxyflourfen PE 0.10 kg/ha*fb* imazethapyr POE 0.10 kg/ha (immediate after harvest of I<sup>st</sup> cut) and one hoeing at 3 week after sowing and one HW at 5 week after sowing both were found at par with each other. The results were in accordance with the findings of Jain (1998) and Tamrakar *et al.* (2002).

Significantly highest WCE was noticed in weed free check. Among the other weed control treatments, it was significantly maximum and at par with treatments oxyflourfen PE 0.10 kg/ha *fb* imazethapyr POE 0.10 kg/ha (immediate after harvest of I<sup>st</sup> cut) and one hoeing at 3 week after sowing and one HW at 5 week after sowing as compared to weedy check (Table 1). This observation was in agreement of Tiwana *et al.* (2002).

#### Integrated weed management in berseem

| Treatment  | Total weed<br>density<br>(no./m <sup>2</sup> ) | Total weed dry<br>weight at harvest<br>(3 cuts) (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) | Weed control<br>efficiency<br>(%) | Weed<br>index for<br>GFY (%) | Weed index<br>for seed yield<br>(%) |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| T <sub>1</sub> - One hoeing at 3 week after sowing and<br>one HW at 5 week after sowing  | 4.4 (18.5)                                     | 5.1 (25.3)  | 72.4                              | 7.3                          | 13.6                                |
| T <sub>2</sub> - Pendimethalin PE 1.0 kg/ha  | 6.2 (37.3)                                     | 7.1 (50.1)  | 45.4                              | 59.4                         | 46.3                                |
| T <sub>3</sub> - Pendimethalin PE 1.0 kg/ha <i>fb</i> one HW<br>at 5 week after sowing   | 5.7 (31.5)                                     | 7.0 (48.4)  | 47.2                              | 49.4                         | 46.8                                |
| T <sub>4</sub> - Oxyflourfen PE 0.10 kg/ha   | 5.3 (27.4)                                     | 6.3 (38.2)  | 58.3                              | 26.7                         | 33.8                                |
| T <sub>5</sub> - Oxyflourfen PE 0.10 kg/ha <i>fb</i> one HW<br>at 5 week after sowing  | 5.0 (24.0)                                     | 6.2 (36.7)  | 64.6                              | 21.8                         | 25.5                                |
| T <sub>6</sub> - Pendimethalin PE 1.00 kg/ha <i>fb</i><br>imazethapyr POE 0.10 kg/ha<br>(immediate after harvest of I <sup>st</sup> cut) | 5.5 (29.3)                                     | 6.8 (44.7)  | 51.2                              | 27.9                         | 38.0                                |
| T <sub>7</sub> - Oxyflourfen PE 0.10 kg/ha <i>fb</i><br>imazethapyr POE 0.10 kg/ha<br>(immediate after harvest of I <sup>st</sup> cut)   | 3.9 (14.2)                                     | 4.9 (23.0)  | 75.0                              | 4.1                          | 7.7                                 |
| T <sub>8</sub> - Imazethapyr POE 0.10 kg/ha<br>(immediate after harvest of I <sup>st</sup> and II <sup>nd</sup><br>cut)                  | 4.9 (22.7)                                     | 5.4 (28.5)  | 69.0                              | 11.7                         | 27.7                                |
| T <sub>9</sub> - Weedy check (control)   | 7.3 (51.8)                                     | 9.6 (91.7)  | -                                 | 62.4                         | 53.2                                |
| T <sub>10</sub> -Weed free check   | 1.0 (0.0)                                      | 1.0 (0.0)   | 100.0                             | 0.0                          | 0.0                                 |
| LSD (P=0.05)   | 0.9  | 0.91  | 7.5                               | 9.9                          | 15.6                                |

| T.I.I. 1  | <b>XX</b> 7 <b>1</b> | 4     |         | . • . 1.4 | • • •        | 1 1.  | •          |                 |
|-----------|----------------------|-------|---------|-----------|--------------|-------|------------|-----------------|
| Ianie I.  | vveed                | count | ana arv | weight    | as intilienc | ea nv | integrated | weed management |
| I HOIC II | , , , ccu            | count | and ary | weight    | as minucine  | cu ny | megiatea   | meeu munugemene |

\*PE- Pre-emergence, POE- Post-emergence, HW- Hand weeding, fb- followed by; GFY - Green forage yield

\*\* Original values given in parentheses are square root transformed  $\sqrt{X+1}$  for statistical analysis.

Among the weed control treatments, significantly minimum weed index (4.08) for green fodder yield (GFY) was with treatment oxyflourfen 0.10 kg/ha followed by imazethapyr 0.10 kg/ha immediate after harvest of I<sup>st</sup> cut and it was at par with one hoeing at 3 week after sowing and one HW at 5 week after sowing and imazethapyr POE 0.100 kg/ha. Whereas, in respect to weed index of seed yield, it was significantly minimum with treatment oxyflourfen PE 0.10 kg/ha *fb* imazethapyr POE 0.10 kg/ha and found at par with treatment one hoeing at 3 week after sowing and one HW at 5 week after sowing (Table 1). These results were in conformity with findings of Jain (1998) and Tiwana *et al.* (2002).

Weed free check was significantly superior with respect to green forage yield (GFY) (47.27 t/ha), dry fodder yield (DFY) (7.13 t/ha), seed yield (0.35 t/ha), straw yield (1.34 t/ha) and crude protein yield (1.22 t/ha) as compared to rest of the treatment except treatment oxyflourfen *fb* imagethapyr and imagethapyr applied after harvest of  $I^{st}$  and  $II^{nd}$  cut, which were found at par (Table 2). The per cent increase over control with respect to GFY, DFY, seed yield, straw yield and crude protein yield in oxyflourfen PE 0.100 kg/ha *fb* imazethapyr POE 0. 10 kg/ha (immediate after harvest of  $I^{st}$  cut) were 59.38, 57.95, 45.85, 49.37 and 57.70, respectively. These results were in agreement with the findings of Tamrakar *et al.* (2002) and Tiwana *et al.* (2002).

Weed free check fetched maximum and significantly higher gross monetary ( $\overline{<}$  1,33,031/ha) and net monetary returns ( $\overline{<}$  64,812/ha) over rest of the treatment except treatment one hoeing at 3 week after sowing and one HW at 5 week after sowing and oxyflourfen PE 0.100 kg/ha *fb* imazethapyr POE 0.10 kg/ha (Table 2). The maximum B: C ratio (2.01) was registered by treatment oxyflourfen PE 0.10 kg/ha*fb* imazethapyr POE 0.10 kg/ha (immediate after harvest of I<sup>st</sup> cut) which was followed by weed-free check (1.95).

#### SUMMARY

Weed-free check treatment recorded significantly lowest total weed count/m<sup>2</sup> and its dry weight at harvest followed by oxyflourfen pre-emergence 0.10 kg/ha *fb* imazethapyr post-emergence 0.10 kg/ha (immediate after harvest of  $I^{st}$  cut) and one hoeing at 3 week after sowing

S.H. Pathan, A.B. Kamble and M.G. Gavit

Table 2. Effect of integrated weed management treatments on yield and economics of berseem

| Treatment    | Green<br>forage<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Dry<br>matter<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Seed<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Straw<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Crude<br>protein<br>yield<br>(t/ha) | Gross<br>monitory<br>returns<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | Cost of<br>cultivation<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | Net monitory<br>returns<br>(x10 <sup>3</sup> ₹/ha) | B:C<br>ratio |
|--------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|--|--------------|
| $T_1$        | 46.55                              | 6.69                             | 0.32                    | 1.33                     | 1.13                                | 127.64  | 64.05   | 59.42  | 1.87         |
| $T_2$        | 20.57                              | 4.52                             | 0.20                    | 0.82                     | 0.76                                | 80.59   | 52.06   | 28.53  | 1.55         |
| $T_3$        | 25.69                              | 3.66                             | 0.20                    | 0.78                     | 0.62                                | 74.33   | 52.11   | 22.22  | 1.43         |
| $T_4$        | 37.17                              | 5.30                             | 0.25                    | 1.03                     | 0.91                                | 100.39  | 56.06   | 44.32  | 1.79         |
| $T_5$        | 39.66                              | 5.81                             | 0.28                    | 1.19                     | 1.03                                | 108.98  | 60.09   | 48.88  | 1.81         |
| $T_6$        | 36.57                              | 5.33                             | 0.23                    | 0.83                     | 0.93                                | 96.46   | 56.65   | 39.81  | 1.70         |
| $T_7$        | 47.04                              | 6.77                             | 0.32                    | 1.34                     | 1.14                                | 128.71  | 59.09   | 64.65  | 2.01         |
| $T_8$        | 43.30                              | 6.29                             | 0.27                    | 1.30                     | 1.12                                | 110.79  | 59.59   | 51.20  | 1.86         |
| Τ9           | 19.10                              | 2.84                             | 0.18                    | 0.68                     | 0.48                                | 60.13   | 52.11   | 8.01   | 1.15         |
| $T_{10}$     | 47.27                              | 7.13                             | 0.35                    | 1.39                     | 1.22                                | 130.31  | 68.22   | 64.81  | 1.95         |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 5.27                               | 0.96                             | 0.07                    | 0.20                     | 0.13                                | 16.62   | -   | 16.62  | -            |

Selling rate of berseem: Green forage (₹ 1.50/kg), seed (₹ 175.00/kg), straw (₹ 1.00/kg)

and one hand weeding at 5 week after sowing which were at par with each other. The weed control efficiency was highest in weed free check and significantly superior to all the treatments. Significantly minimum weed index of berseem, green forage yield and seed yield were observed in treatment oxyflourfen pre-emergence 0.10 kg/ha fb imazethapyr post-emergence 0.10 kg/ha and it was at par with treatment one hoeing at 3 week after sowing and one hand weeding at 5 week after sowing and imazethapyr post-emergence 0.10 kg/ha. The economic studies indicatesed that oxyflourfen pre- emergence 0.10 kg/hafb as post-emergence imazethapyr 0.10 kg/ha immediate after harvest of Ist cut was most cost effective and remunerative. The maximum net monitory returns of ₹ 64,658/ - with B:C ratio of 2.01 was fetched by the treatment oxyflourfen pre-emergence 0.10 kg/ha followed by imazethapyr as a post- emergence application 0.10 kg/ha immediate after harvest of Ist cut was found effective and remunerative followed by treatment one hoeing at 3 week after sowing and one hand weeding at 5 week after sowing.

- Jain KK. 1998b. Floristic composition of berseem-weed ecosystem on weed dynamics. World Weeds 5: 37-39.
- Stidham MA and Singh BK. 1991. Imidazolinone-acetohydroxy acid synthase interactios, pp. 71-90. In: *The Imidazolinone Herbicide* (Eds. Boca Raton FL, Shaner DL and Conner SOL). CRC Press.
- Tamrakar MK, Kewat ML, Agrawal SB and Shukla VK. 2002. Efficacy of herbicides against *Cichorium intybus* in berseem (*Trifolium alexandrium* L.). *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 34(3&4): 333–334.
- Thakur GS, Dubey RK and Tripathi AK. 1990. Evaluation of herbicides for weed management in berseem, pp. 55. In: *Biennial Conference of ISWS*, held during March 4-5, 1990 at JNKVV, Jabalpur.
- Tiwana US, Puri KP, Tiwana MS and Walia US. 2002. Effect of butachlor, trifluralin and fluchloralin on chicory (*Cichorium intybus*) and berseem fodder. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 34(3&4): 251–253.