DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2320-7051.5767

**ISSN: 2320 – 7051** *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci.* **5** (6): 127-131 (2017)





**Research** Article

# Weed Flora and Yield of Sunflower (*Helianthus annus* L.) as Influenced by Pre- and Post-Emergences Application of Herbicides

P. N. Chirde, S. S. Thakare, P. V. Shingrup, J. P. Deshmukh and V. M. Bhale

Department of Agronomy, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola, Maharashtra 444104 \*Corresponding Author E-mail: pvshingrup@gmail.com Received: 14.09.2017 | Revised: 22.10.2017 | Accepted: 25.10.2017

#### ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted to study the efficacy of pre- and post-emergence herbicides and their combination to control the weed in soybean during summer season of the year 2014. Among the various herbicidal treatments Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha (Tank mix) recorded lowest weed density ( $36.05/m^2$ ), dry matter ( $30.59 g/m^2$ ), weed index (10.78 %) and maximum weed control efficiency (64.38 %) at harvest. It also found superior in respect of yield attributes and highest seed yield (1101 kg/ha). Maximum gross monetary return (37102 Rs. /ha) and net monetary return (21000 Rs. /ha) and B:C ratio (2.30) were recorded in Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ <math>0.075 Kg a.i./ha(Tank mix).

Key words: Herbicides, Sunflower, Seed Yield, Summer

## **INTRODUCTION**

Sunflower (Helianthus annus L.) is an important oil seed in India and it rank third after soybean and groundnut as a source of edible oil. The productivity of sunflower has been often deflated due to an array of biotic and abiotic factor. Weed completion is one of the major biotic constraints in realizing higher sunflower productivity in irrigated condition due to wider spacing. Weed growth reduced the seed yield of sunflower upto an extent of 55%<sup>10</sup>. Further, non-availability of labour and high rate of wages during peak periods of agricultural operations increased hiring charges bullock drawn intercultural of implements. Pre and post emergence herbicides may be viable option to control the weeds right from sowing to harvesting of sunflower crop. In order to increase the

productivity of sunflower and reduce the cost of cultivation, the use of pre and post emergence herbicides may be the useful option in weed management. Therefore, present study was undertaken to evaluate the effective and chemical weed management for sunflower.

#### MATERIAL AND METHODS

An field experiment was conducted at farm of Agronomy Department, Dr. Panjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth, Akola during the summer season of 2014. The soil of experiment field was characterized as clay loam in texture, having slightly alkaline pH (7.8), moderate organic carbon status (0.40%), low nitrogen content (224.27 kg/ha), medium available phosphorus content (17.86 kg/ha) and high potassium status (384.25 kg/ha).

**Cite this article:** Chirde, P.N., Thakare, S.S., Shingrup, P.V., Deshmukh, J.P. and Bhale, V.M., Weed Flora and Yield of Sunflower (*Helianthus annus* L.) as Influenced by Pre- and Post-Emergences Application of Herbicides, *Int. J. Pure App. Biosci.* **5(6)**: 127-131 (2017). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.18782/2320-7051.5767

ISSN: 2320 - 7051

The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with seven treatment replicated thrice.

The treatment comprised of Weed free  $(T_1)$ , Weedy check  $(T_2)$ , Mahna-04 @ 2.5 kg/ha PE (T<sub>3</sub>), Pendimethalin 1.0 Kg a.i./ha PE (T<sub>4</sub>), Fluazifop-p- butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i/ha PoE 15 DAS (T<sub>5</sub>), Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha PoE 15 DAS (T<sub>6</sub>) and Fluazifop-pbutyl @ 0.125 kg a.i/ha + Quizalofop ethyl @0.075 kg a.i/ha PoE 15 DAS (Tank Mix)  $(T_7)$ . The gross and net plot size were 3.6 m x 4.2 m and 2.4 m x3.6 m. Sunflower (TAS-82) was sown on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2014 at 60 x 30 cm spacing with 60:60:00 NPK kg/ha. The crop was harvested on 28th May 2014. Randomly five observations of crop and weed parameters were recorded at 20 DAT, 40 DAT, 60 DAT, 80 DAT and at harvest. Weed density and dry weight were recorded with a quadrate  $1 \text{ m}^2$ . Weed biomass  $(g/m^2)$ , Weed control efficiency (%) and Weed index were calculated as per standard formula given by Gautam *et al*<sup>3</sup>., and Gill and Vijaykumar<sup>5</sup>. The data yield, yield attributes were statistically analyzed at 5% level of significance. In case of observation on weeds, normality of distribution was not seen and hence, the values were subjected to square  $\sqrt{x + 0.5}$ root transformation prior to statistical analysis normalize to their distribution.

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

# Weed flora

In the experiment field, predominant weed flora was Chenopodium album, Portulaca oleracea, Tridax procumbens, Lagasca mollis, Euphorbia hirta, Euphorbia geniculata, Alternanathera triandra, Parthenium hysterophorus, Digera arvensis, Argemone Mexicana, Phyllanthus niruri among the dicot weed and *Cynodon dactylon*, Cyperus rotundus, Eleusine indica among the monocot. Weed density

The weed density/ $m^2$  at harvest stage was significantly lowest in Weed free. Among the herbicidal treatment application of Fluazifopp- butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl **Copyright © Nov.-Dec., 2017; IJPAB**  @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha (Tank mix) showed its superiority in lowering down the weed population over Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha, Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha, Pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha, Mahna-04 @ 2.5 kg/ha, among these treatments, Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha, Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha and Pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha were found statistically comparable with each other. The treatment weedy check recorded maximum number of total weeds at the harvest stages of crop. These might be due to application of post emergences herbicides Fluazifop-p- butyl or Quizalofop ethyl was found to be more effective in controlling late coming weeds due to inhibition of acetyl coenzyme, A carboxylase, a key enzyme responsible for synthesis of fatty acid in plants. These results are in agreement with the results reported by Christos A. Damalas<sup>2</sup> and Parmar et al<sup>8</sup>.

## Weed dry weight

There was no weed dry matter due to absence of weed in the weed free treatment. The different herbicidal treatment applied, in which tank mix application of Fluazifop-p- butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha recorded significantly minimum weed dry weight and it was followed by pendimethalin @ 1kg a.i./ha, Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha, Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha but these were statistically at par with each other. This might be due to combination of both herbicides that have longer effect on controlling weed population and brought significant reduction in weed dry matter as compared to weedy check. These results are in agreement with the results reported by Nayak et al<sup>7</sup>., Smita Prachand<sup>9</sup>.

## Weed control efficiency (WCE)

The weed free treatment was found significantly superior by recording 100% weed control efficiency. Among the various herbicidal treatments Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha (Tank mix) recorded maximum weed control efficiency at harvest (64.36%) followed by treatments Fluazifop-p-butyl @

#### Chirde et al

ISSN: 2320 - 7051

0.125 kg a.i./ha (57.88%), Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha (57.09%), Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i./ha (56.83%). This might be due to combination of both herbicides that have longer effect on controlling weeds population and thereby increasing weed control efficiency. These results are in agreement to the finding of Ghosh<sup>4</sup>, Nayak *et al*<sup>7</sup>., Kurchania *et al*<sup>6</sup>. and Channappagoudar, B. B. *et al*<sup>1</sup>.

# Weed index (WI)

Among the weed management practices treatment tank mix application of herbicide Fluazifop-p- butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha recorded minimum weed index (10.78 %). It was followed by Pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha (17.50%), Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha (24.80%), Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha (25.93%), Mahna-04 @ 2.5 kg/ha (35.81%). The weed free treatment recorded the lowest weed index (0%), indicating that there was no reduction in seed yield in this treatment due to less weed infestation. The highest weed index (60.37%) was recorded in weedy check as result of uncontrolled weed growth which leads to higher competition with the crop.

## Yield attributes and yield studies

All weed management practices significantly improved the growth, yield components and yield of sunflower over weedy check. Growth parameters viz., plant height, dry matter production and yield component viz., number of seed/head, filled seeds/head and test weight (1000 seed wt.) were significantly higher in weed free treatment but statistically at par with treatment Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha (Tank mix) which followed by Pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha, Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha and Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha. This might be due to weed free environment especially at critical period of crop-weed competition growth, which might have resulted in increased production.

The highest seed yield of sunflower (1234 kg/ha) was recorded significantly in weed free treatment and it was at par with tank mix application treatment Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha (1101 kg/ha) and the subsequent higher values of seed yield was recorded in Pendimethalin 1 kg a.i./ha (960 kg/ha), Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha (928 kg/ha), Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha (914 kg/ha). This might be due to vigorous growth of crop due to availability of sufficient nutrient, space, moisture and presences of minimum weed densities because of higher weed control efficiency, which would compete for the same. This leads to higher plant height, dry matter accumulation and finally increased seed yield. The lowest sunflower seed yield (489 kg/ha) was recorded in weedy check, this might be due to presence of more weeds which interfered growth and development of crop and compete for nutrients, moisture, light and space. Similar results reported by Channappagoudar B.B *et al*<sup>1</sup>, and Yantang<sup>11</sup>.

# **Economics of various treatments**

The cost of cultivation (18,780 Rs. /ha) and gross monetary returns (41,264 Rs. /ha) were significantly higher in weed free treatment. It was followed by Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha (tank mix) which recorded cost of cultivation (16,102 Rs. /ha) and gross monetary returns (37,102 Rs. /ha). While B:C ratio (2.30) was significantly higher in tank mix application of Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha. The monetary returns among weed control treatment was recorded maximum (22,484 Rs. /ha) in weed free treatment followed by Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha (tank mix) (21,000 Rs. /ha), Pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha (17,659 Rs. /ha), Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 kg a.i./ha (16,452 Rs. /ha) and Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha (15,672 Rs. /ha).

# Table 1: Weed count and Weed dry matter at harvest, weed control efficiency and Weed index influenced by different weed management practices

|   | Dose kg          | Time of<br>application<br>DAS | Weed count m <sup>-2</sup> at harvest |                 |                 | Weed dry matter                             | Weed                         | W. I              |
|---|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Treatments  | a.1./11a         |                               | Monocot                               | Dicot           | Total           | weight at<br>harvest<br>(g/m <sup>2</sup> ) | control<br>efficiency<br>(%) | Weed<br>index (%) |
| $T_1$ – Weed free   | -                | -                             | 1.87<br>(3.00)                        | 1.58<br>(2.00)  | 2.34<br>(4.99)  | 1.43  | 98.33                        | -                 |
| $T_2$ – Weedy check   | -                | -                             | 7.27<br>(52.35)                       | 5.46<br>(29.31) | 9.06<br>(81.66) | 85.83                                       | -                            | 60.37             |
| T <sub>3</sub> - Mahna -04 PE                                       | 2.5              | 1                             | 5.84<br>(33.61)                       | 4.70<br>(21.59) | 7.46<br>(55.20) | 44.55                                       | 48.09                        | 35.81             |
| $T_4^{}$ – Pendimethalin PE   | 1                | 1                             | 5.11<br>(25.61)                       | 4.60<br>(20.66) | 6.84<br>(46.27) | 37.05                                       | 56.83                        | 17.50             |
| T <sub>5</sub> - Fluazifop-p- butyl                                 | 0.125            | 15                            | 4.88<br>(23.31)                       | 4.71<br>(21.68) | 6.72<br>(45.00) | 36.15                                       | 57.88                        | 25.93             |
| T <sub>6</sub> - Quizalofop ethyl                                   | 0.075            | 15                            | 4.72<br>(21.78)                       | 4.75<br>(22.06) | 6.66<br>(43.84) | 36.83                                       | 57.09                        | 24.80             |
| T <sub>7</sub> -Fluazifop-p- butyl + Quizalofop ethyl<br>(Tank Mix) | 0.125 +<br>0.075 | 15                            | 4.11<br>(16.39)                       | 4.49<br>(19.66) | 6.05<br>(36.05) | 30.59                                       | 64.36                        | 10.78             |
| S.E(m)±   |                  |                               | 0.06                                  | 0.09            | 0.08            | 1.21  | -                            | -                 |
| C.D. at 5%  |                  |                               | 0.18                                  | 0.27            | 0.24            | 3.72  | -                            | -                 |

# Table 2: Yield contributing characters and economics of different treatment influenced by different weed management practices

| Treatments  | Dose<br>kg<br>a.i./ha | Time of<br>application<br>DAS | Plant<br>height at<br>harvest | Dry matter<br>production at<br>harvest | Total no. of seeds/head | Filled<br>seeds/head | Test<br>weight<br>(g) | Seed<br>yield<br>kg/ha | Gross<br>monetary<br>returns<br>Rs./ha | Net<br>monetary<br>returns<br>Rs./ha | B:C<br>ratio |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| $T_1^{}$ – Weed free  | -                     | -                             | 189.38                        | 202.53                                 | 1395                    | 1128                 | 52.20                 | 1234                   | 41264                                  | 22484                                | 2.20         |
| T <sub>2</sub> – Weedy<br>check   | -                     | -                             | 158.12                        | 102.22                                 | 1058                    | 673                  | 45.90                 | 489                    | 16767                                  | 3387                                 | 1.25         |
| T <sub>3</sub> - Mahna -04<br>PE  | 2.5                   | 1                             | 170.47                        | 133.67                                 | 1148                    | 836                  | 48.70                 | 792                    | 26865                                  | 11680                                | 1.77         |
| T <sub>4</sub> -<br>Pendim<br>ethalin<br>PE   | 1                     | 1                             | 177.31                        | 166.44                                 | 1256                    | 967                  | 50.67                 | 960                    | 32489                                  | 17659                                | 2.19         |
| T <sub>5</sub> - Fluazifop-p-<br>butyl  | 0.125                 | 15                            | 173.88                        | 148.97                                 | 1235                    | 928                  | 50.30                 | 914                    | 30987                                  | 15672                                | 2.02         |
| T <sub>6</sub> - Quizalofop<br>ethyl  | 0.075                 | 15                            | 176.11                        | 152.83                                 | 1230                    | 931                  | 50.37                 | 928                    | 31402                                  | 16452                                | 2.10         |
| T <sub>7</sub> -Fluazifop-p-<br>butyl +<br>Quizal<br>ofop<br>ethyl<br>(Tank<br>Mix) | 0.125 +<br>0.075      | 15                            | 183.98                        | 188.77                                 | 1314                    | 1029                 | 51.03                 | 1101                   | 37102                                  | 21000                                | 2.30         |
| S.E(m)±   |                       |                               | 2.03                          | 6.00                                   | 43.51                   | 33.16                | 1.31                  | 45.60                  | 1019.33                                | 1019.33                              | -            |
| C.D. at 5%  |                       |                               | 6.26                          | 18.49                                  | 134.06                  | 99.53                | NS                    | 137                    | 3140.87                                | 3140.87                              | -            |

#### CONCLUSION

The study revealed that the highest yield as well as economic return could be realized in sunflower with weed free condition. However, in case of area where the labour scarcity or prohibitive cost exists, the next alternative without draining either economical yield or net profit, B:C ratio, the weed management practice of Fluazifop-p-butyl @ 0.125 kg a.i./ha + Quizalofop ethyl @ 0.075 Kg a.i./ha (tank mix) can be followed.

#### Copyright © Nov.-Dec., 2017; IJPAB

#### REFERENCES

- Channappagoudar, B.B., Biradar, N.R., Bharamagoudar, T.D. and Rokhade, C.J., Physiological Studies on Weed Control Efficiency of Different Herbicides in Sunflower, *Karnataka J. Agric. Sci.*, 21(2): 165-167 (2008).
- Christos, A. Damalas, Herbicide Tank Mixtures: Common Interactions International Journal of Agriculture & Biology, 06(1): 209–212 (2004).

#### Chirde et al

- Gautam, K.C., Mani, V.S. and Sharma, R.K., A note on efficiency, selectivity and residual toxicity of some soil applied herbicide in soybean. *Indian. J. Weed Sci.*, 7(10): 72-74 (1975).
- Ghosh, A.K., Weed competition studies in sunflower. *Pesticide Annual*, **19(8):** 48-49 (1976).
- Gill, and Vijaykumar, Weed index, a new method for reporting with control trial. *Indian J. Agron.*, 14(1): 96-98 (1966).
- Kurchania, S.P., Rathi, G.S., Bhalla, C.S. and Mathew, R., Bioeffficacy of postemergence Herbicides for weed control in soybean (*Glycine max L.*). *Indian J.Weed.Sci.*, 33(1&2): 34-37 (2001).
- Nayak, M.P., Vyas, M.D. and Mandioi, R.S., Efficacy of pedimethalin in soybean (*Glycine max*). *Indian J. Agronomy*, 45(1): 167-165 (2000).

- Parmar, V.T., Patel, J.G. and Vasave, J.B., Efficacy of Different Herbicides in Sunflower under South Gujarat Condition. *Trends in Biosciences*, 7(14): 1624-1629 (2014).
- Smita Prachand. Integrated weed management in soybean (*Glycine max* L.). M.Sc (Agri) Thesis (unpub.) submitted to Dr. P.D.K.V., Akola (2013).
- Wanjari, R.H., Yaduraju, N.T. and Ahuja, R.N., Critical period of weed competition in spring sunflower (*Helianthus annuus* L.). *Indian J. Weed Sci.*, **32(1&2):** 17-20 (2000).
- Yantang, D., Experiment in the control of the weeds in sunflower field with 17.5%benazolinquizalofop-p and its safety. J. Anhui Agric. Sci., 33 (2007).