

# Management of hardy weeds in maize under mid-hill conditions of Himachal Pradesh

Suresh Kumar\*, S.S. Rana, Navell Chander and N.N. Angiras

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

Received: 4 February 2012; Revised: 23 March 2012

## ABSTRACT

Twelve treatments involving tank-mix combinations of atrazine and pendimethalin as pre-emergence followed by (*fb*) post emergence application of 2,4-D and metsulfuron methyl along with hand weeding twice (20 and 40 DAS) and untreated check were tested in maize during 2009 and 2010 at Palampur. *Echinochloa colona, Panicum dichotomiflorum, Cyperus iria, Commelina benghalensis, Ageratum conyzoides, Digitaria sanguinalis* and *Polygonum alatum* were the dominant weeds. Pendimethalin 1.50 kg/ha, atrazine *fb* atrazine 0.75 kg/ha, atrazine 0.75/1.0 + pendimethalin 0.75/0.50 *fb* metsulfuron methyl 4 g/ha effectively controlled *Echinochloa colona*. Atrazine *fb* atrazine brought about significant reduction in the count of *Panicum dichotomiflorum* up to 60 DAS. Pendimethalin *fb* atrazine, atrazine 1.0 + pendimethalin 0.50 *fb* 2, 4-D 0.75 kg/ha and hand weeding twice effectively reduced the population of *Commelina* up to 60 DAS. Pendimethalin/atrazine *fb* atrazine, *fb* atrazine, *atrazine fb* atrazine, *b* atrazine, *b* atrazine, *b* atrazine, *conyzoides* up to 60 DAS. Pendimethalin *fb* atrazine *fb* atrazine, *conyzoides* up to 60 DAS. Pendimethalin/atrazine *fb* atrazine, *atrazine fb* atrazine *fb* atrazine *fb* atrazine, *b* atrazine *fb* atrazine, *b* atrazine, *atrazine fb* atrazine, *atrazine fb* atrazine, *atrazine fb* atrazine, *b* atrazine *fb* atrazine, *b* atrazine, *b* atrazine *fb* atrazine *fb* atrazine *fb*

Key words: Atrazine, Herbicide combinations, Maize, Pendimethalin, Weeds

Maize (Zea mays L.) is an important cereal crop and plays a pivotal role in agricultural economy of Himachal Pradesh. Among the factors responsible for low yields, severe infestation by weeds due to wider row spacing coupled with frequent rains in rainy season inflict huge yield losses upto 68.9% (Walia et al. 2007). In order to obtain economical yield of maize, weeds must be kept under check. For controlling weeds in this crop, preemergence or early post-emergence application of atrazine depending upon the soil type has been recommended. Application of pendimethalin also has been recommended under maize + legume intercropping situations. These herbicides do not control hardy weed species like Commelina benghalensis, Ageratum conyzoides and Brachiaria ramosa as they appear late in the season. The infestation of these weeds is increasing day by day in the maize-growing areas of the state especially where the farmers are using atrazine year after year. So in order to widen the weed control spectrum, it is imperative to use combination of herbicides having different mode of action (Walia et al. 2007, Rana et al. 1998, Kumar et al. 2011). Therefore, tank-mix combinations of atrazine and pendimethalin alone as pre-emergence followed by postemergence application of 2,4-D and metsulfuron-methyl were tried in the present investigation.

#### MATERIALSAND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during kharif seasons of 2009 and 2010 at Palampur in silty clay loam soil having pH 5.6 and medium in available N (289.4 kg/ ha), P (15.4 kg/ha) and K (272 kg/ha). Twelve treatments viz., pre-emergence atrazine and pendimethalin each at 1.50 kg/ha, atrazine and pendimethalin each followed by atrazine 0.75 kg/ha, atrazine and pendimethalin each at half rate in combination at sowing alone and followed by post-emergence 2,4-D at 0.75 kg/ha and metsulfuronmethyl at 4 g/ha, atrazine  $2/3^{rd}$  and pendimethalin  $1/3^{rd}$  in combination at sowing alone and followed by postemergence 2, 4-D at 0.75 kg/ha and metsulfuron-methyl at 4 g/ha, hand weeding twice (20 and 40 DAS) and unweeded check were tested in randomized block design with three replications. Maize hybrid 'KH-101' was sown during first week of June keeping row to row spacing of 60 cm and plant to plant spacing of 20 cm (approximately 20 kg/ha seed rate). The crop was harvested in the first week of October. The crop was fertilized with 120 kg N, 60 kg  $P_2O_5$  and 40 kg  $K_2O$ /ha through urea, single super phosphate and muriate of potash, respectively. The required quantity of half N and whole P2O5 and 40 kg K2O was drilled at sowing. The remaining half N was band placed in two equal splits at knee high and tasseling stages. Hand weeding and hoeing as per treatment was done at 20 and

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

40 days after sowing. Herbicides as per treatment were applied with backpack power sprayer using 600 litre water/ha. Pre-emergence application of herbicides (pendimethalin and atrazine) was made within 48 hours of sowing. Post-emergence application of 2,4-D and metsulfuron-methyl was made on the emergence of broadleaf weeds. Weed count and dry weight (60 DAS and at harvest) were recorded at two spots using a quadrate of 50 x 50 cm. Yields were harvested from net plot. Impact assessment was carried out as per Walia (2003). Economics of the treatments was computed based upon prevalent prices.

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Effect on weeds

Weed flora was composed of *Commelina* benghalensis (25.6 and 12.3% at 60 DAS and at harvest, respectively), Ageratum conyzoides (45.1 and 56.1%), Echinochloa colona (L.) Link (17.6% and 8.7%), Panicum dichotomiflorum (8.4 and 7.7%), Cyperus iria (2.8 and 7.2%), Digitaria sanguinalis (0.0 and 8.2%) and Polygonum alatum (0.5 and 8.0%). Aeschynomene indica also showed its sporadic occurrence especially in the treated plots.

Treatments under evaluation brought about significant variation in the count and dry weight of Echinochloa colona at 60 DAS. All treatments except pendimethalin 1.50 kg/ha (pre), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post) and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuronmethyl 4 g/ha (post) in 2009 were superior to weedy check in suppressing the growth of Echinochloa colona during both the years. However, pendimethalin 1.50 kg/ha and atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha in 2009 and atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) in 2010 could bring about significant reduction in its count. Saini and Angiras (1998) reported significant superiority of atrazine or pendimethalin as well as atrazine followed by atrazine against Echinochloa sp (E. colona and E. crusgalli) in maize.

There was significant variation in the count and dry weight of *Panicum dichotomiflorum* during 2010. Only atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) *fb* atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) could bring about significantly reduction in the count of *Panicum* at 60 DAS. However, all treatments were significantly superior to weedy check in reducing its count and dry weight at harvest. Superiority of herbicide combinations in controlling *Panicum* has been reported by Saini and Angiras (1998).

Pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ ha (post), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2.4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post) and hand weeding twice (20 and 40 DAS) remaining at par with atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) and atrazine 1.0 kg/ ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) in lowering dry weight of Commelina benghalensis were superior to rest of the treatments up to 60 DAS during 2009. All treatments were superior to weedy check in reducing count of Commelina benghalensis up to 60 DAS but atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha fb 2,4-D and atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl could not suppress its growth over unweeded check during 2010. Atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) remained at par with atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (pre), atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre), pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) and hand weeding twice (20 and 40 DAS) gave significantly lower dry weight of Commelina benghalensis over other treatments up to 60 DAS during 2010. Atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) being at par with atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre), pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (pre), pendimethalin 1.50 kg/ha fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) and hand weeding (20 and 40 DAS) gave lower count of Commelina up to 60 DAS in 2010. Similar results have also been shown by Saini and Angiras (1998).

Application of pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post), atrazine 1.50 kg/ha fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha, atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (Post), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ ha (post), hand weeding twice (20 and 40 DAS) and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb. 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post) significantly suppressed the growth of *Ageratum conyzoides* at one or the other stage. The effectiveness of atrazine or pendimethalin (pre-emergence) followed by atrazine (post) against *Ageratum conyzoides* has been well documented (Saini and Angiras 1998). Under the remaining treatments, the count and dry weight of *Ageratum conyzoides* were either higher or not significantly different from the untreated check. This could be attributed

	60 D 2.3 2.3	Connel														
Doese     Time       halin     1.50     Pre $h$ atrazine     1.50/b     Pre/b $h$ atrazine     1.50/b     Pre/b $h$ atrazine     1.50/b     Pre/b $h$ atrazine     0.75     post $h$ atrazine     0.75 /b     post $h$ atrazine     0.50 /b     post	60 D 2.3 2.3	THOO	ıt			Dry weight	eight			Count	unt			Dry w	weight	
1.50     Pre       1.50     Pre       1.50/b     Pre/b       1.50/b     Pre/b       0.75     Pre/b       1     0.004       Pre/b     Pre/b	2009 2.3	AS	At harvest	rest	60 DAS	AS	At harvest	vest	60 DAS	SAC	At harvest	vest	60 DAS	SA	At harvest	/est
1.50 Pre 1.50 Pre 1.50 Pre $\beta$ 0.75 Pre	2.3	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010
1.50 Pre 1.50/b Pre/b $0.75$ post 1.50/b Pre/b post 1.50/b Pre/b $0.75$ post 0.75 Pre/b $0.75$ Pre 0.75 Pre/b $0.75$ Pre/b $0.75/b$ post 0.75 Pre/b post 0.75 Pre/b post 0.75 Pre/b $0.75$ Pre/b $0.75/b$ post 0.75 Pre/b $0.75$ Pre/b $0.75/b$ post 1.0 + Pre $0.75$ Pre/b $0.75/b$ post 1.0 + Pre/b $0.75/b$ post 1.0 + Pre/b $0.75/b$ post 1.0 + Pre/b $0.75/b$ post 1.0 + Pre/b $0.75/b$ post		3.4	2.5	23	$\frac{1.2}{2}$	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.7	2.5	3.1	1.0	1.0	1.2	2.2	1.0
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(c.c)	(10.7) 2.7	(6.7)	(5.3) 1.4	(0.5) 1.9	(15) 13	(1.15) 1.2	(0.7) 1.1	(2.7) 1.7	(5.3) 3.8	(10.67) 1.0	(0.0) 1.4	(0.0) 1.0	(0.5) 1.5	(5.15) 1.0	(0.0) 1.1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(0.0) 1.7	(8.0) 1.0	(4.0) 1.4	(0.3) 1.0	(3.1) 1.0	(0.7) 1.0	(0.46) 1.1	(0.1) (0.1)	(4.0) 1.3	(13.3) 1.0	(0.00) 2.7	(1.3) 1.0	(0.0) 1.0	(1.4) 1.0	(0.00) 1.6	(0.2) 1.0
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(2.7)	(0.0)	(1.3)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.15)	(0.0)	(1.3)	(0.0)	(8.00)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(1.84)	(0.0)
halin $0.75 + Pre - Pre -$	3.8 (18.0)	2.1 (4 0)	0.7	2.1 (4 0)	1.1	1.1	1.1	17 (05)	2.1 (6 00)	2.9 (63)	2.7 (8 00)	0.1.8 (7.7)	(00)	15	1.5	1.1
Italin $0.75$ Prefb       Italin $0.75fb$ post $0.75fb$ $0.75fb$ post $0.75fb$ $0.75fb$ post       Italin $0.004$ post       Italin $0.50$ post       Italin $0.50$ post	2.7	5.0	1.7	2.5	1.0	1.5	12	13	2.8	4.3	2.9	1.4	1.1	2.1	1.5	1.1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(12.0)	(24.0)	(2.7)	(5.3)	(0.0)	(1.4)	(0.41)	(0.7)	(10.0)	(17.3)	(8.00)	(1.3)	(0.1)	(3.7)	(1.22)	(0.2)
Italin $fb$ $0.75fb$ post $0.75$ $0.75fb$ post $0.75fb$ $0.75fb$ post       inin $fb$ $0.75fb$ post       inin $fb$ $0.75fb$ post       inin $0.004$ Pre       halin $0.50$ $0.04$	2.1	3.1	1.7	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.1	I.1	2.3	2.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.0
0.75 +Pre/bfinin fb $0.75fb$ postcon-methyl $0.004$ post $1.0 +$ Prehalin $0.50$	((0)	(10.7)	(2.7)	(2.7)	(1.5)	(1.9)	(0.24)	(0.3)	(8.0)	(9.3)	(00.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(1.5)	(00.0)	(0.0)
falin $fb$ $0.75 fb$ postcon-methyl $0.004$ $1.0 +$ Prehalin $0.50$ $0.50$ $0.50$	1.2	2.1	2.0	2.3	1.7	1.2	1.4	1.2	2.3	5.0	2.9	2.1	1.0	3.1	1.5	1.2
100-meury1 0.004 100+ Pre halin 0.50 0.50	(0.7)	(4.0)	(5.3)	(5.3)	(2.3)	(0.4)	(1.12)	(0.6)	(8.0)	(24.0)	(8.00)	(4.0)	(0.0)	(8.7)	(1.28)	(0.4)
halin $1.0 + Pre$	Ċ	0		•			•			Ċ	•		•		•	
	1.2	2.5	1.4 (1 3)	8.1 C C	1.4	21	1.1 00 160	1.1	(5 33)	67	0.1.0 0.00	1.4	0.0	5.1 (8 (i)	0.1.0	1.1
I'N + IIC/0	2.7	3.0	3.4	1.8	2.1	LI3	1.6	1.1	3.5	2.9	3.7	1.4	1.0	1.3	0.1.9	(1.1) I.1
post	(8.0)	(8.0)	(10.7)	(2.7)	(4.1)	(0.0)	(1.50)	(0.3)	(14.7)	(8.0)	(13.33)	(1.3)	(0.0)	(0.7)	(2.77)	(0.1)
0.75											1	,				
1.0 + Prefb	2.6	1.8	3.6	1.4	2.5	1.1	2.0	1.1	25	2.5	2.7	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.7	1.0
0.50 fb post	(7.3)	(2.7)	(12.0)	(1.3)	(5.2)	(0.2)	(3.49)	(0.1)	(9.3)	(6.7)	(8.00)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(1.99)	(0.0)
methyl 0.004																
	2.8	2.7	2.9	1.7	1.0	1.4	2.0	1.1	1.0	2.3	2.7	1.0	1.0	1.2	1.6	1.0
40 DAS	(8.7)	(8.0)	(9.3)	(2.7)	(0.0)	(6.0)	(3.67)	(0.4)	(0.0)	(5.3)	(8.00)	(0,0)	(0.0)	(0.4)	(1.75)	(0.0)
Untreated check -	3.0 (12.2)	3.0 (17 (1)	2.2	27 (0 3)	(0 U)	67 0	7.1 1.2	165	<u>1</u> 80	1.5	1.6 (10.67)	2.5 (0.2)	1.1	2 F	C7 (103)	1.4 0.00
LSD (P=0.05)	(c.cr) 2.0	1.8	SN	SN	(c.) 1:1	(0.5 0.5	(TO-C)	SZ	SN	(1.01)	(NSN)	(c.e) 1.0	(70)	(+···)	SN SN	(C.)

Table 1. Effect of treatments on count (no/m<sup>2</sup>) and dry weight (g/m<sup>2</sup>) of *Echinochloa* and *Panicum* in maize

Values given in parentheses are original means

Suresh Kumar, S.S. Rana, Navell Chander and N.N. Angiras

maize
.п
Ageratum
and
elina
отте
Ŭ
) of
(g/m <sup>2</sup>
weight
dry
and
m <sup>2</sup>
<b>m</b>
(no
count
on
nts
en
m
eat
tr
of
÷
Effec
5.]
Table

					C	Commelina	a							Ageratum	tum			
	Dose			Count	ıt			Dry weight	ght			Count	t			Dry 1	Dry weight	
Treatment	(kg/ha)	Time	60	60 DAS	At harvest	vest	60 DAS	S	At harvest	st	60 DAS	S	At harvest	est	60 DAS	AS	At harvest	vest
			2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010
Atrazine	1.50	Pre	2.7	2.7	4.6	4.1	1.2		2.9		3.4	7.8	16.0	7.3	1.9	4.0	8.1	3.6
			(8.0)	(6.7) (	(20.00)	(16.0)	(0.5)	(1.8) (	7.83) (	-	22.7)	(0.09)	(256.0)	(52.0)	(2.7)	(15.1)	(65.2)	(12.2)
Pendim ethalin	1.50	Pre	1.5	1.9(4.0)	1.9	5.1	1.9		1.3		3.0	1.7	12.2	2.2	1.6	1.1	2.2	1.3
A trazina fk atrazina	1 50 46 0 75	Dra fk	(2.0)	10/0/01	(4.00) 3.7	(25.3)	(2.9) 1 8	(0.4) 1 4 (	(0.95) 1.5	) (0 <sup>-</sup> L	(12.0)	(2.7)	(148.0)	(6.7)	(1.8)	(0.1)	(4.6) 6.3	(0.9) 1 6
	CI-D af DC-T	post	(4.0)	(n-n) n-T	(6.33)	(0.0)	(2.7)		1.37)		11.3)	(0.0)	(17.3)	(16.0)	(0.0)	(0.0)	(39.3)	(1.6)
Pendim ethalin fb atrazine	1.50 \$ 0.75	Pre fb	3.0	2.5 (6.7)	1.0	3.4	1.0		1.0		2.3	1.7	, 4.1	2.5	1.0	, 1.1	2.4	, 1.3
		post	(10.0)		(0.00)	(10.7)	(0.0)	_	0.00)		(1.3)	(2.7)	(21.3)	(6.7)	(0.0)	(0.2)	(5.6)	(0.8)
A trazine + pendim ethalin	0.75 + 0.75	Pre	2.6	2.7 (8.0)	2.0	2.5	1.6		1.6		3.0	4.9	11.7	5.0	2.0	1.9	5.6	2.0
			(2.3)		(5.33)	(6.7)	(1.9)		2.15) (		12.0)	(22.7)	(193.3)	(24.0)	(3.7)	(2.6)	(41.5)	(3.0)
A trazine + pendim ethalin	0.75 + 0.75	Pre $fb$	I.8	1.7 (2.7)	5.0	3.2	1.7		3.2		4.0	4.3	14.9	7.6	1.7	1.8	6.3	3.5
fb 2,4-D	fb 0.75	post	(2.7)		(24.00)	(9.3)	(2.95)	_	9.36) (	-	20.0)	(17.3)	(221.3)	(573)	(6.1)	(2.1)	(39.1)	(11.7)
A trazine + pendim ethalin	0.75 + 0.75	Pre $fb$	2.2	2.9 (9.3)	4.3	4.0	1.4	_	2.4		2.7	4.1	16.4	2.1	2.1	1.5	7.1	1.2
fb metsulfuron-methyl	fb 0.004	post	(5.3)		(17.33)	(14.7)	(1.1)	_	4.90)	-	12.7)	(16.0)	(266.7)	(4.0)	(5.5)	(1.2)	(49.9)	(0.4)
A trazine + pendim ethalin	1.0 + 0.50	Pre	1.6	3.4	2.2	2.1	1.6		1.7		3.2	4.7	16.0	5.7	1.9	2.4	6.7	2.8
			(3.3)	(10.7)	(6.67)	(4.0)	(1.9)		2.93) (		14.0)	(49.3)	(254.7)	(32.0)	(4.2)	(8.3)	(44.4)	(6.7)
A trazine + pendim ethalin	1.0 + 0.50	Pre $fb$	2.5	1.7	1.0	1.9	1.0		1.0		4.3	1.0	12.2	1.7	1.7	1.0	5.7	1.1
fb 2,4-D	fb 0.75	post	(1.3)	(2.7)	(0.00)	(4.0)	(0.0)	_	0.00)		24.0)	(0.0)	(148.0)	(2.7)	(1.8)	(0.0)	(32.2)	(0.2)
A trazine + pendim ethalin	1.0 + 0.50	Pre $fb$	9 13	2.7	3.2	2.7	1.2		2.2		5.1	2.9	12.4	8.1	1.0	13	5.9	3.4
fb metsulfuron-methyl	fb 0.004	post	(13.3)	(6.7)	(12.00)	(8.0)	(0.0)	_	3.84)		33.3)	(6.3)	(152.0)	(65.3)	(0.0)	(0.9)	(34.0)	(10.9)
Hand weeding		20 & 40	2.5	2.1	3.5	2.3	1.0		2.4		6.3	10.0	11.0	7.4	1.0	3.9	5.9	3.3
		DAS	(9.3)	(4.0)	(14.67)	(5.3)	(0.0)	_	5.88)		38.7) (	100.0	(170.7)	(53.3)	(0.0)	(14.1)	(45.9)	(10.3)
Untreated check			3.1	5.2	3.1	4.7	2.7	- 1	1.9		3.3	1.0	8.6	4.6	2.1	1.0	4.5	2.8
			(10.0)	(26.7)	(10.67)	(21.3)	(1.6)	_	2.88)		15.3)	(0.0)	(101.3)	(45.3)	(3.5)	(0.0)	(25.9)	(12.9)
LSD (P=0.05)			NS	1.8	1.4	1.3	0.6		1.3		3.6	3.4	5.1	3.4	1.1	1.2	3.3	1.6
Values given in the parentheses are the original means	leses are the or	iginal mear	SI															
	- + +					00.0			- 1	- 1-1-:								
I able 5. HITPET OF	reatments	nn ween		v weight wear	Contro		ethereney and plant height of marge		antne		T mai	٩						

Table 3. Effect of treatments on weed dry weight weed control efficiency and plant height of maize

				Weed dry weight (g/m <sup>2</sup> )	$ght (g/m^2)$		WCE	Plant heigh	eight
Treatment	Dose (kg/ha)	Time	2009	6	2010	0	(%)		
			60 DAS	At harvest	60 DAS	At harvest	•	2009	2010
Atrazine	1.50	Pre	3.6 (12.6)	9.7 (93.3)	4.4 (18.3)	3.7 (12.5)	-5.1	276	271
Pendimethalin	1.50	Pre	2.7(8.1)	(6.9(46.9)	2.1(3.5)	3.2 (9.4)	60.5	293	287
Atrazine fb atrazine	1.50 fb 0.75	Pre $fb$ post	2.6(5.8)	2.8 (8.9)	1.0(0.0)	2.6 (5.8)	80.3	278	285
Pendimethalin <i>f</i> <sup>b</sup> atrazine	1.50fb 0.75	Pre <i>fb</i> post	1.9(2.9)	3.1(11.1)	2.3 (4.4)	2.0 (2.9)	75.2	286	277
Atrazine + pendimethalin	0.75 + 0.75	Pre	3.6 (12.8)	6.9 (54.2)	4.1 (15.7)	2.6 (5.6)	3.1	279	275
Atrazine + pendimethalin fb 2,4-D	0.75 + 0.75 fb 0.75	Pre $fb$ post	3.4(10.8)	7.2 (50.6)	3.3 (10.5)	3.9 (14.3)	27.6	280	279
Atrazine + pendimethalin <i>fb</i> metsulfuron-methyl	$0.75 + 0.75 \not p 0.004$	Pre $fb$ post	2.7(6.5)	7.8(60.0)	1.8(2.4)	2.3 (4.4)	69.7	284	178
Atrazine + pendimethalin	1.0 + 0.50	Pre	3.6 (12.8)	7.0(48.1)	3.8 (14.5)	3.0(8.1)	7.1	293	286
Atrazine + pendimethalin <i>fb</i> 2,4-D	1.0 + 0.50 fb 0.75	Pre <i>fb</i> post	2.6(6.1)	6.8(45.3)	2.1(3.6)	3.0 (8.2)	67.0	297	288
Atrazine + pendimethalin <i>fb</i> metsulfuron-methyl	$1.0 + 0.50 \ b 0.004$	Pre <i>fb</i> post	2.6(6.0)	7.0(48.9)	2.1 (3.5)	3.7 (12.7)	67.7	274	273
Hand weeding	•	$20 \& 40^{*}$	1.0(0.0)	7.1 (67.9)	4.3 (17.7)	3.6 (12.0)	39.8	287	281
Untreated check			3.9 (14.8)	7.0(60.8)	3.8 (14.6)	4.0 (18.2)	0.0	188	186
LSD (P=0.05)			1.7	NS	1.2	1.2	•	36	39
Values given in parentheses are original means; *Days after sowing	ays after sowing								

Management of hardy weeds in maize under mid-hill conditions of Himachal Pradesh

to the fact that *A. conyzoides* appeared at the later stage and by that time all other weed species covered the ground fully and let a very few plants of this weed to come up in the weedy check, whereas in treated plots it escaped application of herbicides and its population was increased. *Ageratum* usually appears in large numbers in later stages and its distribution appeares to be contiguous rather than uniform as there is large variation in the population of this weed. Weed control treatments could not bring about significant variation in the count and dry weight of *Digitaria sanguinalis, Cyperus* sp., *Polygonum alatum* and *Aeschynomene indica* at any stage during both the years.

Weed control treatments brought about significant variation in the total weed dry weight at 60 DAS during both the years, and at harvest during 2010. At 60 DAS during 2009, hand weeding twice and pendimethalin fb atrazine could bring about significant reduction in total weed dry weight over untreated check. The other treatments could not curtail the growth of the survivors or the late comers rather they assumed alarming growth in the absence of competition. However, in 2010, pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post), atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre), atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post) and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuronmethyl 4 g/ha (post) were all effective in reducing total weed dry weight as compared to untreated check upto harvest. Atrazine fb atrazine resulted in highest weed control efficiency of 80.3%. This was followed by pendimethalin fb atrazine, atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ ha fb metsulfuron-methyl, atrazine 1.0 kg/ha +pendimetnalin 0.50 kg/ha fb metsulfuron-methyl and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.50 kg/ha fb 2,4-D. Mundra et al. (2003), Patel et al. (2006) and Walia et al. (2007) also reported significant reduction in count and dry weight of weeds with tank-mix application of herbicides in maize.

## Effect on crop

All weed control treatments were significantly superior to untreated check in influencing plant height during 2009. However, under atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) *fb* metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ ha (post) plant height did not differ significantly from that under untreated check in 2010. Controlling weeds is important in obtaining desired plant stand as evident from higher plant population under all treatments over the untreated check. However, atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ ha (post) had lower effective plant population than all the other treatments.

All treatments were significantly superior to untreated check in increasing grain and straw yield of maize in 2009. However, possibly owing to toxic effect of metsulfuronmethyl, atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) did not differ significantly from weedy check in influencing the yield of maize in 2010. Atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post) during both the years and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) and atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb. metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) in 2009, all being at par to handweeding and atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) resulted in significantly higher grain as well as straw yield of maize over rest of the treatments. Grain and straw yield of maize was negatively associated with weed biomass (r = -0.584 and -0.336, respectively) and count (r = -0.447and -0.509), though, the degree of association was low. Weeds in untreated check reduced maize grain yield by 50.3% over the best treatment atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post).

#### Impact assessment and economics

Treatment efficiency index (TEI), which indicates weed killing potential and phytotoxicity on the crop (Walia 2003), was highest under atrazine *fb* atrazine. This was followed by pendimethalin fb atrazine and atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha fb 2,4-D. The treatments under study followed the similar trend for crop resistance index (CRI) as TEI. Atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha fb metsulfuron-methyl and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.50 kg/ha had lower weed persistence index (WPI) as compared to other treatments. However, owing to phytotoxicity of metsulfuron-methyl especially during the second year of study, these treatments were next only to atrazine fb atrazine, pendimethalin fb atrazine and atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha fb 2,4-D for TEI and CRI. Atrazine/pendimethalin fb atrazine, atrazine + pendimethalin fb 2,4-D or metsulfuron-methyl, pendimethalin and hand weeding twice were superior to atrazine + pendimethalin (pre) alone for weed management index (WMI), agronomic management index (AMI) and integrated weed management index (IWMI). This suggested that surviving weeds or those appearing in late flushes need to be taken care with some post-emergence herbicide application or manually. Dry matter accumulation under atrazine 1.50 kg/ha treated plots was higher than

Treatment	Dose (kg/ha)	Time	Pla	Plant population /ha	Cob (	Cob length (cm)		Cob girth (cm)	No. 0	No. of rows /cob	Graii (t	Grain yield (t/ha)	Stover yield (t/ha)	yield a)
			2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010	2009	2010
Atrazine	1.50	Pre	60,101	58,331	15.0	14.27	7 14.6	13.6	14.3	13.60	4.69	4.34	16.2	16.0
Pendimethalin	1.50	Pre	65,604	60.275									16.4	16.5
Atrazine fb atrazine	1.50 fb 0.75	Pre fb post	64,895	62,220						14.33	5.87	7 5.47	17.2	17.2
Pendimethalin fb atrazine	1.50 fb 0.75	Pre <i>fb</i> post	65,694	64,720	15.1	15.87	7 14.3	14.0	15.1				17.1	16.9
Atrazine + pendimethalin	0.75 + 0.75	Pre	63,488	63,053	14.9	14.80	0 14.9	13.9	14.8				16.5	16.5
Atrazine + pendimethalin fb 2,4-D	0.75 + 0.75 fb 0.75	Pre fb post	68,101	64,164	16.1	15.47	7 14.6		14.1				17.3	17.1
Atrazine + pendimethalin $fb$	0.75 + 0.75  fb	Pre <i>fb</i> post	64,895	62,498	16.3		3 15.6		14.9				17.8	13.5
metsulfuron-methyl	0.004													
Atrazine + pendimethalin	1.0 + 0.50	Pre	63,779	61,386	15.0		0 15.3	14.1	14.7				16.2	16.0
Atrazine + pendimethalin fb 2,4-D	1.0 + 0.50 fb 0.75	Pre <i>fb</i> post	67,985	65,220		16.13			16.7	15.07	6.17	7 5.63	17.1	16.8
Atrazine + pendimethalin fb	1.0 + 0.50  fb  0.004	Pre fb post	60,843	48,331									17.1	12.1
metsulfuron-methyl	5	4												
Hand weeding	'	20 and 40 DAS	63,985	61,664	14.4	14.27	7 14.8	13.9	14.2	13.80	5.90	5.46	16.8	16.4
Untreated check			40,843	34,443	12.0	11.80	0 12.4	12.3	12.6	11.3		2.68	13.5	12.1
LSD (P=0.05)			10,830	9,482	2.3	2.8	8 1.5	1.3	1.1	1.2	0.82	2 0.55	0.9	0.8
Table 5. Impact assessment indices and economics of weed control treatments in maize	ndices and econom	ics of weed cor	ntrol trea	atments	in ma	aize								
Treatment	Dose (	Oose (kg/ha) Time		TEI	WPI (	CRI W	/ IMM	AMI	IWMI	CWC	GR (	BRWC	GRWC NRWC MBCR	MBCR
Atrazine		1.50	Pre	0.51	1.68	1.25 -	30.2	-31.2	-30.7	1350	54640	15860	14510	10.75
Pendimethalin		1.50	Pre	1.64	1.23	3.43	2.7	1.7	2.2	2780	57318	18538	15758	5.67
Atrazine fb. atrazine	1		Pre <i>fb</i> post	4.73		7.37	2.4	1.4	1.9	2265	64079	25299	23034	10.17
Pendimethalin fb. atrazine	1		Pre <i>fb</i> post	3.10	0.33	5.68	2.4	1.4	1.9	3695	60553	21773	18078	4.89
Atrazine + pendimethalin	0	0.75 + 0.75	Pre	0.69	1.04	1.40	54.5	53.5	54.0	2065	57791	19011	16946	8.21
Atrazine + pendimethalin <i>fb</i> . 2,4-D	0.75 + 0.0	0.75 + 0.75 fb 0.75 Pre	Pre <i>fb</i> post	1.08	1.01	1.97	6.5	5.5	6.0	2808	61103	22323	19515	6.95
Atrazine + pendimethalin <i>fb</i> . metsulfuron-methyl		0.75 + 0.75 fb 0.004 Pre.	Pre <i>fb</i> post	2.33		4.34	2.4	1.4	1.9		57272	18492	15547	5.28

Table 4. Effect of different treatments on yield attributes and yield of maize

16

Treatment	Dose (kg/ha)	Time	TEI	MPI		IMW	AMI	IWMI	CWC	GR	GRWC	CRI WMI AMI IWMI CWC GR GRWC NRWC MBCR	MBCR
Atrazine	1.50	Pre	0.51	1.68	1.25	-30.2	-31.2	-30.7	1350	54640	15860	14510	10.75
Pendimethalin	1.50	Pre	1.64	1.23	3.43	2.7	1.7	2.2	2780	57318	18538	15758	5.67
Atrazine fb. atrazine	1.50 fb 0.75	Pre fb post	4.73	0.38	7.37	2.4	1.4	1.9	2265	64079	25299	23034	10.17
Pendimethalin <i>fb</i> . atrazine	1.50 fb 0.75	Pre <i>fb</i> post	3.10	0.33	5.68	2.4	1.4	1.9	3695	60553	21773	18078	4.89
Atrazine + pendimethalin	0.75 + 0.75	Pre	0.69	1.04	1.40	54.5	53.5	54.0		57791		16946	8.21
Atrazine + pendimethalin $fb. 2, 4-D$	0.75 + 0.75 fb 0.75	Pre <i>fb</i> post	1.08	1.01	1.97	6.5	5.5	6.0	2808	61103		19515	6.95
Atrazine + pendimethalin <i>fb</i> . metsulfuron-methyl	0.75 + 0.75 <i>fb</i> 0.004	Pre <i>fb</i> post	2.33	0.27	4.34	2.4	1.4	1.9	2945	57272		15547	5.28
Atrazine + pendimethalin	1.0 + 0.50	Pre	0.57	0.72	1.41	21.4	20.4	20.9	1827	54478	15698	13871	7.59
Atrazine + pendimethalin <i>fb</i> . 2,4-D	1.0 + 0.50 fb 0.75	Pre <i>fb</i> post	3.07	0.45	4.40	3.0	2.0	2.5	2570	66290	27510	24940	9.70
Atrazine + pendimethalin fb. metsulfuron-methyl	1.0 + 0.50 fb 0.004	Pre <i>fb</i> post	1.68	0.28	3.76	2.3	1.3	1.8	2707	52471	13691	10984	4.06
Hand weeding		20 & 40 DAS	1.55	1.12	2.35	4.9	3.9	4.4	12000	60388	21608	9608	0.80
Untreated check			00.00	1.00	1.00	'	'	'	1	38780	'	'	•
LSD (P=0.05)													
Grain ₹=6750 per tonne, Straw= ₹1000/tonne; TEI, treatment efficiency index; WPI, weed persistence index; CRI, crop resistance index; WMI, weed management index; AMI, agronomic management index; IMWI, integrated weed management index; CWC, cost of weed control (₹/ha); GR, gross returns (₹/ha); GRWC, gross returns due to weed control (₹/ha); NRWC, net returns due to weed control (₹/ha); Benefit: cost ratio: Pendimethalin. ₹490/ke : Atrazine. 290/ke : ₹2.4-D. 250/ke. Metsulfuron methvl. ₹140/8 gram	EI, treatment efficiency index; WPI, weed persistence index; CRI, crc gement index; IMWI, integrated weed management index; CWC, co. lue to weed control ( $\overline{(7/ha)}$ ; NRWC, net returns due to weed control zine. 290/kg : $\overline{7}$ 24-D. 250/kg. Metsulfuron methyl. $\overline{7}$ 140/8 gram	index; WPI, we itegrated weed i ha); NRWC, ne . 250/kg. Metsu	ed persist manageme t returns c ulfuron me	ence inde ent index lue to we	ex; CRI ;; CWC ed con 140/8 g	, crop res , cost of ' trol (₹/hå ram	istance in weed con (); MBCF	dex; WM trol (₹/ha t, Margin	I, :: la				
		ć			)								

Management of hardy weeds in maize under mid-hill conditions of Himachal Pradesh

under untreated check, and therefore, unusual values of WMI, AMI and IWMI were noticed under this treatment.

Control of weeds using herbicides was a cheaper proposition than with manual methods. Cost of weed control using herbicides was only 11.3-30.8% of the total cost under manual weeding. Atrazine 1.50 kg/ha was the cheapest treatment, whereas pendimethalin 1.50 kg/ha fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha, was the costliest. Only atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.50 kg/ha fb 2, 4-D, atrazine 1.50 kg/ha fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) and atrazine 0.75 kg/ ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha fb 2,4-D gave higher gross returns due to weed control over traditional practice. However, all herbicidal treatments were superior to hand weeding twice in terms of net returns due to weed control and MBCR. Atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post) resulted in the highest net returns due to weed control. This was followed by atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) and atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 g/ha (post). Highest MBCR was fetched under atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre), and was closely followed by atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) and atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post) Higher MBCR with herbicides has also been reported by Kumar et al. (2011).

It was concluded that atrazine 1.0 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.5 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post), followed by atrazine 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb atrazine 0.75 kg/

ha (post), atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb 2,4-D 0.75 kg/ha (post), pendimethalin 1.5 kg/ha (pre) fb. atrazine 0.75 kg/ha (post) and atrazine 0.75 kg/ha + pendimethalin 0.75 kg/ha (pre) fb. metsulfuron-methyl 4 g/ha (post) could be the better alternatives to hand weeding in managing different flushes of weeds in maize.

### REFERENCES

- Kumar S, Angiras NN and Rana SS. 2011. Integrated weed management in maize. *Himachal Journal of Agricultural Research* 37(1): 1-9.
- Mundra SL, Vyas AK and Maliwal Pl. 2003. Effect of weed and nutrient management on weed growth and productivity of maize (Zea may L.). Indian Journal Weed Science 35: 57-61.
- Patel VJ, Upadaya PN, Patel JB and Meisuriya MI. 2006. Effect of herbicide mixtures on weeds in *Kharif* maize in middle of Gujarat conditions. *Indian Journal Weed Science* 38: 57.
- Rana SS, Sharma JJ and Manuja S. 1998. Evaluation of promising herbicide mixtures for weed control in maize (*Zea mays L.*). *New Agriculturist* 9 (1&2): 1-5.
- Saini JP and Angiras NN. 1998. Efficacy of herbicides alone and in mixtures to control weeds in maize under mid-hill conditions of Himachal Pradesh. *Indian Journal Weed Science* **30** (1&2): 65-68.
- Walia US. 2003. Weed Management. Kalyani Publishers, Ludhiana 396p.
- Walia US, Singh S and Singh B. 2007. Integrated control of hardy weeds in maize (*Zea may* L.) *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 39(1&2): 17-20.