Agriways 6 (2):37-40 (July-December 2018)



ISSN: 2321-8614(Print) ISSN: 2454-2318 (Online)

# EFFECT OF DIFFERENT HERBICIDES ON WEEDS AND GROWTH OF

BARLEY (Hordeum vulgare L.) IN CENTRAL PUNJAB

Amandeep Kaur, Santosh Kumar\*, Nishan Singh, Mandeep Kaur

Department of Agriculture, Mata Gujri College, Shri Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab- 140-406 Corresponding Author: <u>santoshagro.nd@gmail.com</u>

Received: 08/08/2018

Accepted: 18/12/18

#### ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted during *Rabi* season of 2017 at Experimental Farm of Department of Agriculture, Mata Gujri College, Shri Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab to study the efficacy of different herbicides in barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) in Central Punjab. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with seven treatments and replicated thrice. On the basis of result summarized the minimum weed density, dry weight of weeds and weed index was recorded in application of herbicide sulfosulfuron @ 25g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS which was followed by clodinofop propargyl @ 60g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS, it was significantly inferior over rest of treatments at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stage. The maximum growth parameters were maximum with the application of  $T_5$ - sulfosulfuron @ 25 g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS followed by  $T_6$ - clodinofop propargyl @ 60g/ha + hand weeding and  $T_7$  – fenoxaprop p ethyl @ 100g/ha at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stage.

Keywords: Fenoxaprop, Herbicides, Weeds and Weed index

#### Introduction

Barley (Hordeum vulgare L.) is an annual plant of Poaceae family. It is the third important cereal after rice and wheat in India. In 2016, barley production for India was 1.51 million tons. In 2016-17, barley was cultivated on 9 thousand hectare area with a production of 32 thousand metric tons in Punjab (Anonymous, 2017-2018). Weed interference is one of the most important limiting factors which decrease crop yields and consequently global food production. Weeds are the most underestimated crop pests in tropical agriculture and cause maximum loss in the yields of crops than other pests and diseases. Yield reduction caused by weeds is directly proportional to the number of weeds present in the crop and in certain areas of the province this can result in losses of 10% (Paynter and Hills 2009). If the weeds are not controlled at the critical stages of crop, they may cause reduction in yield up to 66% (Kumar et al. 2011). They compete with crop plants for light, water and Nutrients. Weeds inflict huge nutrient and yield losses, suggesting adopt strong management strategies (Suresha et al. 2015). Therefore, weed management have been a major challenge for crop producers from the start of agriculture.

### **Materials and Methods**

A field experiment was conducted at Experimental Farm of Department of

Agriculture, Mata Gujri college, Shri Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab during Rabi season of 2016-2017. The experiment laid out in randomized block design with three replicated. The treatment details are as  $T_1$  – weedy check,  $T_2$  – weed free,  $T_3$  – sulfosulfuron @ 25g/ha, T<sub>4</sub> – clodinofop propargyl @ 60g/ha, T<sub>5</sub> – sulfosulfuron @ 25g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS, T<sub>6</sub> – clodinofop propargyl @ 60g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS,  $T_7$  – fenoxaprop p ethyl @ 100g/ha. The soil of experiment field gangetic alluvial having clay loam texture with pH (7.4), medium in organic carbon (0.49%), electrical conductivity (0.56 dS/m at 25 °C), available P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (14.41 kg/ha), K<sub>2</sub>O (170.12 kg/ha) and N (285.12 kg/ha). The pre-treated seed variety PL 426 were sown by hand drilling in between the rows by using barley seed at the rate of 87.5 kg/ha with a spacing of 22.5 cm on 15<sup>th</sup> November, 2016. The recommended dose of fertilizers of NPK for wheat is 120, 60, 40 kg/ha. Applied 1/3 dose of nitrogen and full dose P2O5 and K2O as basal and remaining dose of nitrogen was applied in two split at 30 DAS and 60 DAS. Post emergence herbicides were used which are applied at 30 DAS of the crop and hand weeding was done at 45 DAS. Regular biometric observations were recorded at periodic intervals of 30 DAS, 60 DAS, 90 DAS and at harvest stage of five selected plant. Yield attributes parameters were recorded just before harvesting of crop.

Weed density					Wee	ed dry ma	tter		Wee	Weed			
Treatments	30	60	90	harvest	30	60	90	Harvest	30	60	90	Harvest	index
	DAS	DAS	DAS	stage	DAS	DAS	DAS	stage	DAS	DAS	DAS	stage	
T <sub>1-</sub> Weedy check	6.9	4.1	4.3	5.07	18.89	26.20	31.79	39.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	39.71
11 Weedy eneek	(46.5)	(16.3)	(18.5)	(25.3)	(356.4)	(685.9)	(1010.2)	(1530.7)					
	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.71 (0.00)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.00
T <sub>2</sub> - Weed free	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)						
T <sub>3</sub> - ulfosulfuron @	6.60	3.59	3.82	4.74	18.60	5.95	17.67	24.77	3.03	94.91	69.13	59.93	16.59
25g/ha	(43.1)	(12.5)	(14.2)	(22.0)	(345.5)	(34.9)	(311.9)	(613.2)					
T <sub>4</sub> - Clodinofop	6.61	3.77	4.08	4.77	18.70	5.99	17.75	24.87	1.90	94.84	68.87	59.60	18.59
propargyl @	(43.3)	(13.8)	(16.2)	(22.3)	(349.6)	(35.4)	(314.5)	(618.2)					
60g/ha													
T <sub>5</sub> - ulfosulfuron @	6.50	2.94	3.33	3.89	18.43	4.97	17.25	24.50	4.8	96.5	70.6	60.8	4.38
25g/ha + hand	(41.8)	(8.2)	(10.6)	(14.7)	(339.4)	(24.2)	(297.2)	(599.8)					
weeding at 45													
DAS	6.50	2.20	2.44	2.00	10 57	5.50	17.51	24.69	2.27	05.66	60.69	60.22	7.20
T <sub>6</sub> - Clodinotop	6.59	5.20	5.44	5.99	18.57	5.50	17.51	24.08	3.37	95.00	69.68	00.22	7.20
propargyl @	(43.0)	(9.8)	(11.4)	(15.4)	(344.3)	(29.8)	(306.2)	(008.8)					
weeding at 45													
DAS													
T <sub>7</sub> - Fenoxaprop p	6.71	3.42	3.56	4.35	18.58	5.72	17.56	24.75	3.21	95.30	69.52	60.02	13.65
ethyl @	(44.5)	(11.3)	(12.2)	(18.4)	(344.9)	(32.2)	(307.9)	(611.9)					
100g/ha													
SEm±	1.53	1.34	1.27	1.24	3.95	2.95	3.20	2.61	1.12	0.14	1.93	1.60	3.81
C.D. at 5%	4.72	4.13	3.91	3.83	12.19	9.10	9.87	8.04	3.45	0.44	5.95	4.94	11.75

Statistical data were analysed by standard p Table 1: Effect of herbicide application on weeds

procedure by Panse and Sukhatme 1961).

# Table 2: Effect of herbicide application on growth attributes of barley

Treatments	Plant height (cm)				No	of tiller. me	rs in rur eter	nning	Dry n	natter ad	ccumula	Leaf area index			
	30	60	90	harve	30	60	90	Harv	30	60	90	Harv	30	60	90
	DA	DA	DA	st	DA	DA	DA	est	DA	DA	DA	est	DA	DA	DA
	S	S	S	stage	S	S	S	stage	S	S	S	stage	S	S	S
T <sub>1</sub> - Weedy check	29.1	40.	70.	78.17	41.	51.7	54.	44.78	10.	23.	28.	32.75	0.8	2.2	2.6
	4	69	01		04	8	71		69	66	00		4	3	7
T <sub>2</sub> - Weed free	39.7	60.	91.	100.7	51.	83.6	89.	77.87	15.	29.	35.	43.95	0.9	4.0	4.0
	8	76	92	5	73	9	40		88	80	17		3	0	7
T <sub>3</sub> - Sulfosulfuron @	35.6	52.	81.	90.25	49.	72.0	75.	65.19	14.	25.	31.	39.23	0.9	2.9	3.2
25g/ha	2	55	33		41	0	55		44	65	60		0	3	2
T <sub>4</sub> - Clodinofop propargyl	36.3	50.	79.	88.69	48.	70.7	71.	60.39	14.	25.	31.	38.98	0.9	2.7	3.2
@ 60g/ha	4	74	51		88	8	85		34	44	16		1	3	3
T <sub>5</sub> - Sulfosulfuron @	35.5	57.	88.	96.58	51.	80.1	85.	73.99	15.	27.	32.	41.96	0.9	3.8	3.8
25g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS	7	03	76		22	0	40		53	44	71		2	0	7
T <sub>6</sub> - Clodinofop propargyl	36.7	56.	87.	95.22	50.	78.5	83.	71.46	15.	27.	32.	41.24	0.9	3.5	3.7
@ 60g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS	5	52	59		12	1	58		25	13	17		2	7	3
T <sub>7</sub> - Fenoxaprop p ethyl @	36.3	53.	82.	90.29	49.	73.4	78.	64.15	14.	25.	31.	39.45	0.9	3.0	3.2
100g/ha	5	28	55		59	1	88		48	86	47		1	7	7
SEm±	1.45	2.4	2.9	3.26	1.7	2.53	2.6	2.28	0.4	0.9	1.1	1.38	0.0	0.1	0.2
		2	8		3		7		3	4	1		2	6	3
C.D. at 5%	4.46	7.4	9.1	10.04	5.3	7.79	8.2	6.75	1.3	2.9	3.4	4.25	0.0	0.4	0.7
		7	8		2		3		5	0	1		6	9	2

# EFFECT OF DIFFERENT HERBICIDES ON WEEDS AND GROWTH OF BARLEY (*HORDEUM VULGARE* L.) IN CENTRAL PUNJAB

## **Result and Discussion**

The result of the present study indicated that weed density and weed dry matter and growth parameters of plant such as plant height, number of tillers in running meter, dry matter accumulation, leaf area index of barley crop showed positive correlation with yield and were significantly influenced by different herbicide application (Table 1 and Table 2).

### Effect of herbicides on weeds

All the weed control treatments reduce the density of weeds, dry weight of weeds and weed index in comparison to weedy check. Minimum weed density, dry weight of weeds and weed index was recorded in application of herbicide sulfosulfuron @ 25g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS which was followed by clodinofop propargyl @ 60g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS, it was significantly inferior over rest of treatments at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stage. The maximum weed density and dry weight of weeds was observed in alone application of clodinofop propargyl @ 60 g/ha various weed control treatments. among However, there was no significantly difference among various weed control treatments at 30 DAS. Post emergence herbicides were used in the treatments, therefore there was no significant difference among weed control treatments before 30 DAS. In the herbicidal treatment of sulfosulfuron @ 25g/ha + hand weeding, it gave best result because sulfosulfuron control both grassy as well as broad leaf weeds and it inhibits ALS enzyme. Herbicidal treatments of clodinofop propargyl reduce minimum weeds because it control only grassy weeds and it inhibits synthesis of Acetyl co enzyme. Similar findings were reported by Hamada et al. (2013) and Chaudhary et al. (2016)

The various weed control treatments, maximum weed control efficiency was observed in herbicidal treatment of sulfosulfuron @ 25g/ha + Hand weeding at 45 DAS which was closely followed by clodinofop propargyl @ 60 g/ha + Hand weeding at 45 DAS, it was significantly inferior over rest of treatments at 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stage (Table no.4.3). However, there was no significant difference among various weed control treatments at 30 DAS. The minimum weed control efficiency was recorded in alone application of clodinofop propargyl @ 60 g/ha among various weed control treatments. But it is higher than weedy check. The higher WCE might be due to better weed control, which was associated with reduction in weed density and weed dry weight. The application of clodinofop propargyl and sulfosulfuron gave high weed control efficiency. Similar findings were reported by Brar and Walia (2010) and Kumari *et al.* (2013

# Effect of herbicide on growth attributes

Among the application of herbicidal treatments, maximum growth attributes were recorded in sulfosulfuron @ 25g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS which was followed by clodinofop propargyl @ 60g/ha + hand weeding at 45 DAS and fenoxaprop p ethyl @ 100g/ha, which was significant over all at all the growth stages except 30 DAS. At 30 DAS, there was no significant difference among various weed control treatments. The minimum plant height was observed in weedy check and maximum in weed free. The minimum growth attributes were observed in application of clodinofop propargyl @ 60g/ha among herbicidal treatments. The boosted root and shoot growth parameters due to low weed growth and their competition with crop for several growth factors with the use of herbicides. Hence it increased plant height, number of tillers and dry matter. Also nutrients to these plants were easily available. Due to which plant and number of branches increased, which ultimately increased the dry matter of plants. The reason for higher values of growth parameter can be discussed in the light of fact that under these treatments crop had comparatively less weed competition for growth factors and thereby more availability of growth factors such as light, space, water, nutrients etc which are necessary for the growth and development of crop than other treatments, that resulted in better crop growth and ultimately more dry matter accumulation. Weedy check produced significantly lower plant height and dry matter of barley. This was due to less availability of nutrients thereby reduction in dry matter of plants. And the reason for lower values of growth parameters incase of alone application of clodinofop propargyl @ 60 g/ha was that it only reduce grassy weeds and have

## References

Anonymus (2018). Barley production in Punjab. The Food Basket of India, Government of Punjab.

Brar A S and Walia U S (2010). Rice residue position and load in conjunction with weed control treatments interference with growth and development of *Phalaris minor* Retz. and wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). *Indian J. of Weed Sci.* **42** (3/4): 163-167.

Chaubey R K, Shukla M K, Prasad P, Dowson J and Singh V (2014). Response of Wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) to Seeding Methods and Weed Management Practices. *Inter. J. of Tropical Agri.* **32**: 3-4.

Choudhary D, Singh P K, Chopra N K and Rana S C (2016). Effect of herbicides and herbicide mixtures on weeds in wheat. *Indian J. of Agri. Res.* **50** (2): 107-112

Hamda S H E, Abdel-Lateef M F, Abdelmonem A E, El-Kholy R M A and Helalia A A R (2013). Efficiency of certain clodinafop-propargyl formulations in controlling annual grassy weeds in wheat. *Annals of Agri. Sci.* **58**(1):13-18.

Kumar S, Angiras N N and Rana S S (2011). Bio-efficacy of clodinafop-propargly + Metsulfuron-methyl against complex weed flora in wheat. *Indian J. Weed Sci.* **43**: 195-198.

Kumari A, Kumar S, Singh B and Dhaka A (2013). Evaluation of herbicides alone and in combination for weed control in wheat. *Indian J. of Weed Sci.* **45** (3): 210-213.

Panse V G and Sukhatme P V (1961). *Statistical Methods for Agricultural Research Workers*, pp 321. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. ICAR, New Delhi.

Paynter B H and Hills A L (2009). Barley and rigid rye grass competition is influenced by crop cultivar and density. *Weed Technology* **23**(1):40-48.

no effect on second flux of weeds. Similar results were also reported by Brar and Walia (2010) and Chaubey *et al.* (2014)

Suresha K, Ashish R S S, Negi S C and Kumar S (2015). Assessment of yield and nutrient losses due to weeds in maize based cropping systems. *Himachal J. of Agril Res.* **41**(1): 42-48.