

Print ISSN : 0972-8813  
e-ISSN : 2582-2780

[Vol. 18(3), Sept-Dec, 2020]

# Pantnagar Journal of Research

(Formerly International Journal of Basic and  
Applied Agricultural Research ISSN : 2349-8765)



G.B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology, Pantnagar



## **ADVISORYBOARD**

### **Patron**

Dr. Tej Partap, Vice-Chancellor, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Members**

Dr. A. S. Nain, Ph.D., Director Research, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. A. K. Sharma, Ph.D., Director, Extension Education, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. S. K. Kashyap, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agriculture, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. N. S. Jadon, Ph.D., Dean, College of Veterinary & Animal Sciences, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. K. P. Raverkar, Ph.D., Dean, College of Post Graduate Studies, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Sandeep Arora, Ph.D., Dean, College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Alaknanda Ashok, Ph.D., Dean, College of Technology, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Alka Goel, Ph.D., Dean, College of Home Science, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. R. S. Chauhan, Ph.D., Dean, College of Fisheries, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. R. S. Jadaun, Ph.D., Dean, College of Agribusiness Management, G.B. Pant University of Agri. & Tech., Pantnagar, India

## **EDITORIALBOARD**

### **Members**

Prof. A. K. Misra, Ph.D., Chairman, Agricultural Scientists Recruitment Board, Krishi Anusandhan Bhavan I, New Delhi, India  
Dr. Anand Shukla, Director, Reefberry Foodex Pvt. Ltd., Veraval, Gujarat, India  
Dr. Anil Kumar, Ph.D., Director, Education, Rani Lakshmi Bai Central Agricultural University, Jhansi, India  
Dr. Ashok K. Mishra, Ph.D., Kemper and Ethel Marley Foundation Chair, W P Carey Business School, Arizona State University, U.S.A  
Dr. B. B. Singh, Ph.D., Visiting Professor and Senior Fellow, Dept. of Soil and Crop Sciences and Borlaug Institute for International Agriculture, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.  
Prof. Binod Kumar Kanaujia, Ph.D., Professor, School of Computational and Integrative Sciences, Jawahar Lal Nehru University, New Delhi, India  
Dr. D. Ratna Kumari, Ph.D., Associate Dean, College of Community / Home Science, PJTSAU, Hyderabad, India  
Dr. Deepak Pant, Ph.D., Separation and Conversion Technology, Flemish Institute for Technological Research (VITO), Belgium  
Dr. Desirazu N. Rao, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Biochemistry, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India  
Dr. G. K. Garg, Ph.D., Dean (Retired), College of Basic Sciences & Humanities, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Humnath Bhandari, Ph.D., IRRI Representative for Bangladesh, Agricultural Economist, Agrifood Policy Platform, Philippines  
Dr. Indu S Sawant, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Research Centre for Grapes, Pune, India  
Dr. Kuldeep Singh, Ph.D., Director, ICAR - National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India  
Dr. M. P. Pandey, Ph.D., Ex. Vice Chancellor, BAU, Ranchi & IGKV, Raipur and Director General, IAT, Allahabad, India  
Dr. Martin Mortimer, Ph.D., Professor, The Centre of Excellence for Sustainable Food Systems, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom  
Dr. Muneshwar Singh, Ph.D., Project Coordinator AICRP- LTFE, ICAR - Indian Institute of Soil Science, Bhopal, India  
Prof. Omkar, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Zoology, University of Lucknow, India  
Dr. P. C. Srivastav, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Soil Science, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Prashant Srivastava, Ph.D., Cooperative Research Centre for Contamination Assessment and Remediation of the Environment, University of South Australia, Australia  
Dr. Puneet Srivastava, Ph.D., Director, Water Resources Center, Butler-Cunningham Eminent Scholar, Professor, Biosystems Engineering, Auburn University, U.S.A.  
Dr. R. C. Chaudhary, Ph.D., Chairman, Participatory Rural Development Foundation, Gorakhpur, India  
Dr. R. K. Singh, Ph.D., Director & Vice Chancellor, ICAR-Indian Veterinary Research Institute, Izatnagar, U.P., India  
Prof. Ramesh Kanwar, Ph.D., Charles F. Curtiss Distinguished Professor of Water Resources Engineering, Iowa State University, U.S.A.  
Dr. S. N. Maurya, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, G.B. Pant University of Agric. & Tech., Pantnagar, India  
Dr. Sham S. Goyal, Ph.D., Professor (Retired), Faculty of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, University of California, Davis, U.S.A.  
Prof. Umesh Varshney, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Microbiology and Cell Biology, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India  
Prof. V. D. Sharma, Ph.D., Dean Academics, SAI Group of Institutions, Dehradun, India  
Dr. V. K. Singh, Ph.D., Head, Division of Agronomy, ICAR-Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, India  
Dr. Vijay P. Singh, Ph.D., Distinguished Professor, Caroline and William N. Lehrer Distinguished Chair in Water Engineering, Department of Biological Agricultural Engineering, Texas A&M University, U.S.A.  
Dr. Vinay Mehrotra, Ph.D., President, Vinlax Canada Inc., Canada

### **Editor-in-Chief**

Dr. Manoranjan Dutta, Head Crop Improvement Division (Retd.), National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, New Delhi, India

### **Managing Editor**

Dr. S. N. Tiwari, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Entomology, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Assistant Managing Editor**

Dr. Jyotsna Yadav, Ph.D., Research Editor, Directorate of Research, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

### **Technical Manager**

Dr. S. D. Samantray, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Computer Science and Engineering, G.B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, India

## CONTENTS

<b>Marker assisted selection for aromatic and semi-dwarf segregants in cross of aromatic Katarni rice</b> SUNDARAM BHARTI, P.K. SINGH, KUMARI SUVIDHA, SATYENDRA, S. P. SINGH, ANAND KUMAR and MANKESH KUMAR	<b>188</b>
<b>D<sup>2</sup> and principal component analysis for variability studies in <i>Vigna</i> and <i>Phaseolus</i> species</b> PRIYANKA BHARETI, R. K. PANWAR, ANJU ARORA and S. K. VERMA	<b>193</b>
<b>Assessment of genetic parameters in F<sub>5</sub> recombinants derived from <i>Indica</i> rice (<i>Oryza sativa</i> L.) line Pusa 6A</b> PRACHI PRIYA, MANKESH KUMAR, TIRTARTHA CHATTOPADHYAY, BISHUN DEO PRASAD, SWETA SINHA, ANAND KUMAR and SATYENDRA	<b>198</b>
<b>Genetic diversity analysis by D<sup>2</sup> clustering of fodder yield and its related traits in forage sorghum</b> HARSH DEEP, INDRANI CHAKRABORTY, SATYAWAN ARYA, PUMMY LAMBA, S. K. PAHUJA and JAYANTI TOKAS	<b>203</b>
<b>Genetic diversity for morpho-physiological and seed vigour traits in wheat (<i>Triticum aestivum</i> L.)</b> PUNEET KUMAR, Y.P.S. SOLANKI, VIKRAM SINGH and ASHISH	<b>209</b>
<b><i>In vitro</i> plant regeneration from mature embryo using different plant growth regulators in wheat genotype HD 3059</b> SWATI SHARMA, ASHWANI KUMAR, ANIL SIROHI, R. S. SENGAR, KAMAL KHILARI, MUKESH KUMAR and MANOJ K. YADAV	<b>215</b>
<b>Weed management and crop geometry effect on nutrient uptake and yield in aerobic rice</b> VASUNDHRA KAUSHIK, S. P. SINGH, V. P. SINGH, TEJ PRATAP and B. S. MAHAPATRA	<b>222</b>
<b>Studies on sucker control in natu tobacco (<i>Nicotiana tabacum</i> L.) under rainfed vertisols</b> S. JAFFAR BASHA, P. PULLI BAI, S. KASTURI KRISHNA and C. CHANDRASEKHARA RAO	<b>228</b>
<b>Seed and oil yield of bidi tobacco (<i>Nicotiana tabacum</i> L.) varieties as influenced by planting geometry and fertilizer levels under rainfed vertisols</b> S. JAFFAR BASHA, P. PULLI BAI, S. KASTURI KRISHNA and C. CHANDRASEKHARA RAO	<b>232</b>
<b>Comparison of non-linear models on area, production and productivity of sugarcane crop in Uttar Pradesh</b> JHADE SUNIL and ABHISHEK SINGH	<b>237</b>
<b>Performance of improved varieties of true Cinnamon (<i>Cinnamomum verum</i> J. Presl.) in Andaman Islands, India</b> AJIT ARUN WAMAN, POOJA BOHRA and R. KARTHIKA DEVI	<b>243</b>
<b>Changing climate and its effect on rice yield in Meghalaya</b> DEOTREPHY K. DKHAR, SHEIKH MOHAMMAD FEROZE, RAM SINGH and LALA I.P. RAY	<b>249</b>
<b>Age related changes in morphometrical studies on ductus deferens of guinea fowl (<i>Numida meleagris</i>)</b> TAMILSELVAN S, B. S. DHOTE and MEENA MRIGESH	<b>257</b>



<b>Occurrence of gastrointestinal nematodes in goats slaughtered at Rewa, India</b> D. MARAVI, A. K. DIXIT and POOJA DIXIT	<b>261</b>
<b>Autoimmune haemolytic anaemia in a dog-A case report</b> NEERAJ KUMAR, MUNISH BATRA and R.S. CHAUHAN	<b>265</b>
<b>Erythrocytic anaplasmosis with <i>Fasciolosis</i> in a cross-bred cattle: A case report</b> NEERAJ KUMAR and MUNISH BATRA	<b>269</b>
<b>Modification and evaluation of Pant-ICAR controlled traffic seed-cum-deep fertilizer applicator for multi-crop seeder-cum-deep placement of fertilizers applicator</b> MANISH KUMAR, T.C THAKUR, MANOJ KUMAR and SATYA PRAKASH KUMAR	<b>272</b>
<b>Drying characteristics of shrimp (<i>Metapenaeus dobsoni</i>) in electrical dryer</b> D.S. ANIESRANI DELFIYA, S. MURALI, P.V. ALFIYA and MANOJ P. SAMUEL	<b>281</b>
<b>Baur dam breach analysis using various Manning's roughness values</b> MEENAKSHI RAMOLA, JYOTHI PRASAD and H. J. SHIVA PRASAD	<b>286</b>
<b>Study of constipation and related factors among female students of Pantnagar</b> RITA SINGH RAGHUVANSHI, NIDHI JOSHI, DIKSHA SINGH, SHIKHA SINGH, MEENAL and DASHRATH BHATI	<b>290</b>
<b>Work -related musculoskeletal disorders among chikankari workers in Lucknow (U.P.)</b> POONAM SINGH and KATYAYNI	<b>297</b>
<b>Technology adoption and productivity enhancement in groundnut cultivation: An impact assessment of farm women groups</b> K.UMA, T. NIVETHA and S. PRAVEENA	<b>302</b>
<b>Health hazard and constraints of chikankari worker in Lucknow (U.P.)</b> POONAM SINGH and KATYAYNI	<b>310</b>
<b>Studies on Indigenous Agricultural Technical Knowledge prevalent among the farmers of Assam for the management of common pests and diseases in major crops</b> DEVAMITRA TARAFDAR and NIRMAL MAZUMDER	<b>315</b>
<b>Television viewing pattern among students of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar</b> ANIL KUMAR MALIK, KRISHAN YADAV and SUNIL KUMAR	<b>325</b>
<b>Media content development and it's standardization for farmers</b> REETA DEVI YADAV, GEETAMATI DEVI and RITA GOAL	<b>331</b>
<b>Analysis of learning behavior and pattern of online learners on a MOOC platform</b> G.R.K. MURTHY, SEEMA KUJUR, S. SENTHIL VINAYAGAM, YASHAVANTH B.S., CH. SRINIVASA RAO, P. S. PANDEY, VANITA JAIN and INDRADEVI T.	<b>338</b>



## Weed management and crop geometry effect on nutrient uptake and yield in aerobic rice

VASUNDHRA KAUSHIK, S. P. SINGH, V. P. SINGH, TEJ PRATAP and B. S. MAHAPATRA

*Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar-263145 (U.S. Nagar, Uttarakhand)*

**ABSTRACT:** A field experiment was conducted at Norman E. Borlaug Crop Research Centre of Govind Ballabh Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, laid out in split plot design (SPD) with four replications during *Kharif* season of 2017 to assess the effect of weed management practices and row spacing on growth and yield attributes of aerobic rice as well as density, dry matter accumulation and nutrient uptake by weeds. Among row spacing, the lowest total weed density, total dry matter accumulation and nutrient uptake was recorded under 25 cm row spacing. The highest weed control efficiency (73.9%) at 60 DAS, grain yield (4.2 t/ha) and B: C ratio (2.0) was achieved at row spacing of 25 cm with application of Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha (PEm) */b* Penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha (PoEm). While, 20 cm and 30 cm row spacing were significantly at par to row spacing of 25 cm, in terms of weed control efficiency, yield and B:C ratio. Row spacing of 25 cm recorded the highest number of shoots per square metre at 60 DAS and at maturity. However, among weed management practices, Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha (PEm) */b* Penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha (PoEm) recorded lowest removal of nutrients (N, P and K) by weeds, highest plant height, number of shoots per square meter and grain yield (4.4 t/ha) than other weed management treatments after weed free.

**Key words:** Growth, herbicides, Pendimethalin, Penoxsulam, Post-emergence (PoEm), Pre-emergence (PEm), rice, row spacing, weeds

“Aerobic” rice grows well under dry conditions in the absence of flooding, offers a promising means to combat the looming water crisis. Farmers can use 30 to 40% less irrigation water by growing aerobic rice; however, this savings typically comes with a yield penalty of 10 to 25%, which discourages many rice growers in the tropics from adopting the new technology (Ghosh *et al.*, 2012). Aerobic rice is a resource conservation practice which has got high water use efficiency by cutting down the water losses caused due to the seepage and percolation. Weed management is one of the most important aspects which affect the growth and productivity of aerobic rice (Joshi *et al.*, 2016). Taking the advantages of saving water and labour and increasing system productivity, aerobic rice has been believed to be an optimal option for rice production (Kumar and Ladha, 2011). Aerobic rice are subjected to much higher weed pressure than puddled transplanted rice system (Rao *et al.*, 2008), in which weeds are suppressed by standing water and transplanted rice seedlings, which provide ‘head start’ over germinating weed seedlings. In aerobic rice, weeds emerge simultaneously with crop seedlings and grow more quickly in moist soil than in puddled transplanted rice resulting in severe competition for resources to the crop. Therefore, weeds present the main biological constraint to the success of aerobic rice (Chauhan, 2012) and failure to control weeds result in yield losses ranging from 50 to 90%

(Chauhan and Johnson, 2011; Chauhan and Opena, 2012). Hence, proper management of weeds is the need of the hour to sustain the productivity of aerobic rice. On the other hand, row spacing also plays a significant role for adopting the weed management practices and also decides the plant population which in turn affects the final grain yield (Sirazuddin *et al.*, 2015). Herbicides with different crop geometries may show different effect on crop, hence, standardization of herbicides and their application time with different row spacing is essential for the efficient weed management and crop growth and development.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted during *Kharif* season of 2017 at Norman E. Borlaug Crop Research Centre of G. B. Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, with a view to find out the efficacy of different pre and post emergence herbicides for controlling the weeds and also their effect on aerobic rice in three planting geometries. Three planting geometries ( $S_1$ -20 cm,  $S_2$ -25 cm and  $S_3$ -30 cm) in main plots and four weed management practices ( $W_1$ - Weedy check,  $W_2$ - Pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha */b* Penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha,  $W_3$ - Cyhalofop-butyl + Penoxsulam 150 g/ha,  $W_4$ - Weed free) in sub plots were studied in a split plot design (SPD), with four replications.

Seeds of “*Pant dhan 18*” were seeded manually in lines at seed rate of 40 kg/ha with different row spacing of 20cm, 25cm and 30cm apart in all plots. Pendimethalin on the next day of sowing and post emergence herbicides penoxsulam and cyhalofop-butyl were applied at 20 DAS using 500 litre of water by knapsack sprayer fitted with flat fan nozzle. Plant height, expressed in cm, was recorded from randomly selected 5 tagged plants from one meter row length marked in each plot at 60 DAS and maturity of the crop. Total number of shoots was counted one meter row length marked in each plot for observation at 60 DAS and at maturity and mean number of shoots was computed to number of shoots/m<sup>2</sup>. The dry matter of crop and all the weed species at 60 DAS and maturity was observed by quadrat (50 cm x 50cm) and all plants falling within quadrat were cut from the base and air dried first (4-5 days) separately and then dried in a hot air oven at 70°C±5°C temperature and was expressed as gram per square metre. The number of weeds in each plot was counted by using quadrat of 50cm x 50cm from area marked for observation at 60, 80 DAS and at maturity of crop and was computed as number of weeds/m<sup>2</sup>. In weeds nitrogen (Subbiah and Asija, 1956), phosphorous (Olsen’s *et al.*, 1954) and potassium content (Jackson, 1973) was estimated by modified Alkaline KMnO<sub>4</sub> method, Olsen’s method and Flame emission spectrophotometer method, respectively. Nutrient removal by weeds was calculated by using the following formula(1):

The weed control efficiency of all the treatments was calculated by using the following formula in relation to reduction of total dry weight of weeds in treated plot over the weedy plot which was expressed as percentage (Mani *et al.*, 1973).

Different yield attributes were also observed. Number of panicles was counted and expressed as number of panicles per square metre. Plant height and grains per panicle was calculated by averaging 5 panicles. The number of total grains was counted and grain weight was expressed by computing 1000 grain weight in gram. The grain and straw yield was recorded from net plot area expressed as tonnes per hectare. The weight of total produce (biological yield) per net plot as mentioned in grain yield parameter. The net plot area (4m x 2m), (4m x 1.75m), (4m x 1.5 m) was harvested from the gross plot area of 5m x 3m. Harvest index (HI) was worked out by using following formula:

$$\text{Nutrient uptake (kg/ha)} = \text{Nutrient content (\%)} \times \text{Dry matter of weeds (kg/ha)} \quad \dots\dots\dots 1$$

$$\text{WCE (\%)} = \frac{\text{DW of weeds in weedy plot} - \text{DW of weeds in treated plot}}{\text{DW of weeds in weedy plot}} \times 100 \quad \dots\dots\dots 2$$

$$\text{HI (Harvest Index)} = \frac{\text{Grain yield}}{\text{Biological yield}} \times 100$$

Cost of production and the additional weed management treatment was calculated. Benefit: cost ratio was calculated to assess the economics of the crop produce influenced by different treatments.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Relative weed density

The major weed flora in the experimental field at 60 DAS were observed as follows *Echinochloa colona* (10%) as grassy, *Alternanthera sessilis* (15%) as broad leaf weeds, *Cyperus iria* (15%) and *Cyperus difformis* (19%) as sedges under weedy situation. However, other weeds species such as *Echinochloa crus-galli*, *Leptochloa chinensis*, *Ammania baccifera*, *Fimbristylis miliaceae* and *Celosia argentic* with relative weed density of 41% were recorded in weedy check plot.



Fig. A view of experiment

### Plant height

Plant height of rice crop was not influenced significantly with different row spacing at 60 DAS and maturity crop growth stages (Table 1). Among the different herbicidal treatments pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha/b penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha achieved significantly higher plant height with the weed free at 60 DAS. Weedy situation recorded lowest plant height, as dominating weeds competed with the rice

**Table 1: Effect of different row spacing and weed management practices on plant growth (at 60 DAS and at maturity), total weed density and dry matter accumulation and weed control efficiency at 60 DAS**

Treatments	Plant height (cm)		Shoots/m <sup>2</sup>		Crop dry matter accumulation (g/m <sup>2</sup> )		Total weed density (No./m <sup>2</sup> )	Total weed dry matter accumulation (g/m <sup>2</sup> )	Weed control efficiency (%)
	60 DAS	At maturity	60 DAS	At maturity	60 DAS	At maturity	60 DAS	60 DAS	60 DAS
Row spacing (cm)									
20	73.1	94.1	228	227	405.7	550.5	2.79 (8.59)	3.05 (10.59)	63.9
25	76.9	94.7	231	229	398.1	549.1	2.65 (7.65)	2.71 (7.67)	73.9
30	73.6	94.2	223	223	396.1	548.2	3.78(17.14)	3.99 (19.52)	33.5
SEm±	1.57	2.04	0.95	1.43	1.84	2.16	0.09	0.04	-
CD at 5%	NS	NS	3.37	5.04	6.5	NS	0.33	0.15	-
Weed management									
Weedy	65.4	87.7	126	125	132.8	201.9	5.01(25.45)	5.36 (29.34)	-
Pendimethalin@1kg/ha /fb	80.9	96.8	283	280	492.26	666.9	2.98 (8.61)	3.28 (10.20)	65.2
Penoxsulam @22.5 g/ha									
Cyhalofop-butyl+Penoxsulam @ 150g/ha	74.0	94.9	270	272	480.84	659.9	3.07 (9.36)	3.37 (10.83)	63.1
Weed free	77.7	97.9	231	229	493.9	668.2	1.0 (0.0)	1.0 (0.0)	100
SEm±	1.35	1.26	2.19	2.59	1.94	4.33	0.25	0.05	-
CD at 5%	4.86	3.7	6.4	7.57	5.68	8.6	0.75	0.16	-

Original values are given in *parentheses***Table 2: Effect of different row spacing and weed management treatments on nutrient content and removal by weeds at 80 DAS**

Treatment	Nitrogen content (%)	Nitrogen removal (kg/ha)	Phosphorous content (%)	Phosphorous removal(kg/ha)	Potash content (%)	Potash removal (kg/ha)
Row spacing(cm)						
20	0.80	09.71	0.10	2.60	0.40	22.10
25	0.80	11.20	0.10	2.22	0.40	21.90
30	0.90	11.80	0.10	2.90	0.40	22.20
SEm±	0.01	1.00	0.01	0.30	0.01	1.96
CD at 5%	NS	3.47	NS	1.04	NS	6.78
Weed management						
Weedy	1.20	26.12	0.30	5.47	0.60	52.82
Pendimethalin@1kg/ha /fb	1.10	07.49	0.20	2.22	0.50	14.76
Penoxsulam @22.5 g/ha						
Cyhalofop-butyl+Penoxsulam @ 150g/ha	1.20	10.02	0.20	2.61	0.60	20.89
Weed free	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SEm±	0.01	1.26	0.01	0.25	0.01	3.1
CD at 5%	0.04	3.67	0.03	0.76	0.03	9.0

**Table 3: Effect of different row spacing and weed management practices on the yield attributes and yield of aerobic rice**

Treatment	Panicles/m <sup>2</sup>	Grains/panicle	1000-grain weight (g)	Grain yield (t/ha)	Straw yield (t/ha)	Biological yield (t/ha)	Harvest index (%)
Row spacing (cm)							
20	185	99	23.21	4.00	8.00	12.00	33.6
25	187	106	23.45	4.20	8.30	12.50	37.4
30	186	102	23.41	3.40	7.10	10.60	31.5
SEm±	2.78	0.78	0.16	0.25	0.39	0.54	1.63
CD at 5%	NS	2.78	NS	0.72	0.86	NS	NS
Weed management							
Weedy	106	98	22.74	2.1	4.5	6.6	31.3
Pendimethalin@1kg/ha /fb	218	105	23.35	4.4	8.8	13.2	35.3
Penoxsulam @22.5 g/ha							
Cyhalofop-butyl + Penoxsulam @ 150g/ha	199	101	22.71	4.3	9.2	13.5	33.5
Weed free	222	105	24.63	4.8	8.7	13.5	36.5
SEm±	3.44	0.88	0.17	0.14	0.44	0.48	2.34
CD at 5%	10.04	2.59	0.51	0.42	1.05	1.41	NS



**Table 4: Effect of different row spacing and Weed Management Practices on economics of rice production**

Row spacing (cm)	Weed management	Treatments				
		Dose (g /ha)	Cost of cultivation	Gross return	Net return	B:C ratio
20	Weedy check	-	22480	32395	9915	0.4
20	Pendimethalin /b Penoxsulam	1000 /b 22.5	27,060	70060	43000	1.5
20	Cyhalofop-butyl + Penoxsulam	150	24980	66650	41670	1.6
20	Weed free (Pendimethalin+2HW 20 and 40 DAS)	1000 /b 20 and 40	27,300	75950	48650	1.7
25	Weedy check	-	22840	46965	24485	1.0
25	Pendimethalin + Penoxsulam	1000 /b 22.5	27,060	83235	56175	2.0
25	Cyhalofop-butyl + Penoxsulam	150	24980	68665	43685	1.7
25	Weed free (Pendimethalin+2HW at 20 and 40 DAS)	1000 /b 20 and 40	27,300	83700	56400	2.0
30	Weedy check	-	22840	26350	3510	0.1
30	Pendimethalin /b Penoxsulam	1000 /b 22.5	27,060	58900	31840	1.1
30	Cyhalofop-butyl + Penoxsulam	150	24980	60450	35470	1.4
30	Weed free (Pendimethalin+2HW 20 and 40 DAS)	1000 /b 20 and 40	27,300	65100	37800	1.3

crop for natural resources and checked the growth of the crop due to which height was reduced.

### Plant density

Number of shoots/m<sup>2</sup> increased with the advancement of growth up to 60 DAS in all the treatments but after 60 DAS, reduction in number of shoots/m<sup>2</sup> was observed under different treatments due to the competition. Among different row spacing, 25 cm recorded highest number of shoots which was at par with 20 cm and significantly higher than 30 cm row spacing at 60 DAS and at maturity. These findings were in accordance with Singh *et al.* (2011). Under different weed management practices, pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha /b penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha recorded significantly higher number of shoots/m<sup>2</sup> over all the other treatments at 60 DAS and at maturity. Lowest numbers of shoots were recorded under weedy condition (Table 1). Increasing in plant spacing is associated with increase in number of tillers because the plant has got more area to draw nutrients required for tiller formation Munyithya *et al.* (2017), however, beyond 25 cm row spacing no. of plants per unit becomes less that is why no. of shoots per metre square is less in 30 cm spacing.

### Dry matter accumulation of crop

The dry weight increased with the advancement of crop growth and highest dry weight was obtained at harvest stage. Considering the dry matter accumulation of rice crop at various growth stages highest dry matter accumulation was recorded with 20cm row spacing which was significantly higher than other two spacing (25 and 30cm) at 60 DAS. Irrespective of the weed management practices, crop dry matter production increased with advancement in crop age. Crop dry matter accumulation in weed free treatment was at par with pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha /b penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha and significantly higher over other

treatments at 60 DAS and at maturity (Table 1). This might be due to application of both pre and post-emergence herbicide which controlled weeds at both early and later stage resulted in optimum tiller density (m<sup>2</sup>), more number of grains/panicle and hence more population of rice in closer spacing which resulted in more total dry matter production (Hasanuzzaman *et al.*, 2008).

### Total weed density and dry matter of total weed species at 60 DAS

Among different row spacing the lowest total weed density and dry matter were recorded with 25 cm row spacing. However, pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha /b penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha recorded lowest total weed density and dry matter among different weed management practices (Table 1). Total weed density increased up to 60 DAS and declined thereafter. This might be due to coverage of crop canopy at later stage may smothered weeds. These results were in accordance with the findings of Prakash *et al.* (2013).

The use of any single strategy cannot provide effective, season-long weed control as different weeds vary in their dormancy and growth habit. So, there is a need to integrate different weed management, such as the use of agronomic practices by altering row spacing followed by the use of pre- and post-emergence herbicides (Chauhan, 2012).

### Nutrient content and removal by the weeds

Nutrient removal by weeds was the manifestation of weed biomass in the field (Payman and Singh, 2008). Different row spacing of rice had significant effect on nutrients (N, P and K) uptake by weeds at 80 DAS. The highest removal of nitrogen (11.8kg/ha), phosphorous (2.90 kg/ha) and potassium (22.2 kg/ha) was recorded under the 30 cm row spacing at 80 DAS. Among weed management practices the highest removal of nitrogen (26.12 kg/ha), phosphorous

(5.47 kg/ha) and potassium (52.82 kg/ha) by weeds was achieved in weedy check. Weed free treatment gave significantly lowest nutrient removal followed by pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha *fb* penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha at 80 DAS (Table 2). This was attributed due to lesser weed dry matter production. Results clearly showed that major parts of the nutrient are utilized by the weeds which create competition between crop and weeds.

### Weed control efficiency

The highest weed control efficiency 96.59, 72.81 and 82.32 % was obtained at row spacing of 25 cm with the pre- and post- emergence application of pendimethalin 1.0 kg /ha *fb* penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha (S2W2) at 40, 60 and 80 DAS, respectively and proved to be superior over other treatments. This might be due to control of weeds more effectively through the pre and post-emergence herbicide at early and later stages of crop. These findings are in support with the findings given by Singh *et al.* (2007).

### Yield and Yield contributing characters

All the yield attributing characters except grains/panicle were not influenced significantly by different row spacing. Highest no. of grains/panicle (106) was achieved with row spacing of 25 cm compared to other two row spacing (20 and 30cm). However, among weed management practices pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha *fb* penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha recorded highest panicle/m<sup>2</sup> (218), grains/panicle (105) and 1000 grain weight (23.35 gm) after weed free and found superior over other herbicidal treatments (Table 3).

Highest grain yield (4.2 t/ha) and straw yield (8.3 t/ha) were achieved with 25 cm row spacing. Among, the weed management practices pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha *fb* penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha recorded highest grain yield (4.4 t/ha) over other herbicidal treatments after weed free (4.8 t/ha). However, biological yield in varying row spacing and harvest index in both varying row spacing and in weed management practices were found non-significant (Table 3).

### Economics

The highest cost involved in the case of weed free treatment. Highest gross return (83235 Rs/ha), net return (56175 Rs/ha) and B:C ratio (2.0) was achieved with pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha *fb* penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha along with the 25cm row spacing (S2W2) followed by 20cm row spacing along with post-emergence application of cyhalofop-butyl + penoxsulam (readymix) 150g/ha (S1W3) after weed free treatment (S2W4). While, lowest

net return, gross return, B: C ratio was attained in 30 cm row spacing along with all the weed management practices after the weedy check. This might be due to the lowest grain yield and straw yield in 30cm row spacing (Table 4). It is concluded that pendimethalin 1.0 kg/ha *fb* penoxsulam 22.5 g/ha along with 25cm row spacing showed better control of grassy, broad leaf and sedges and yielded highest rice grain yield among different executed treatments.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge NEBCRC, G.B. Pant Univ. of Agri. and Tech., Pantnagar for cooperative assistance.

### REFERENCES

- Chauhan, B.S. (2012). Weed ecology and weed management strategies for dry-seeded rice in Asia. *Weed Technol.*, 26: 1-13.
- Chauhan, B.S. and Johnson, D.E. (2011). Row spacing and weed control timing affect yield of aerobic rice. *Field Crops Res.*, 121: 226-231
- Chauhan, B.S. and Opena, J. (2012). Effect of tillage systems and herbicides on weed emergence, weed growth, and grain yield in dry-seeded rice systems. *Field Crop Res.*, 137: 56-69. doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2012.08.016
- Ghosh, A., Dey, R. and Singh, O.N. (2012). Improved management alleviating impact of water stress on yield decline of tropical aerobic rice. *Climatology & Water Management*, 104 (3): 584-588.
- Hasanuzzaman, M.I., Obaidul and Shafiuddin, B. (2008). Efficacy of different herbicides over manual weeding in controlling weeds in transplanted rice. *Australian Journal of Crop Science*, 2(1): 18-24.
- Jackson, M.L. (1973). Soil Chemical Analysis, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, Pp. 38-56.
- Joshi N., Singh V.P, Dhyani V.C, Singh S.P. and Tej Pratap (2016). Effect of geometry and weed management practices on crop growth and yield of direct seeded (Aerobic) rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Ecology, Environment and Conservation*, 22 (371-376) ISSN0971-765X.
- Kumar, V. and Ladha, J.K. (2011). Direct seeding of rice: recent developments and future research needs. *Adv Agron.*, 111:297-413
- Mani, V.S., Malla, M.L., Gautam, K.C. and Bhagwandas (1973). Weed killing chemicals in potato cultivation. *Indian Farm.*, VXXII: 17-18.
- Munyithya, A.K., Murori, R., Chemining, G.N. and

- Kinama, J. (2017). Effect of plant spacing and intermittent flooding on growth and yield of selected lowland rice varieties in Kenya. *Int. J. Agron. Agri. R.*, 11:123-130.
- Olsen, S. R., Cole, C. V., Watanabe, F. S. and Dean, L. A. (1954). Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with  $\text{NaHCO}_3$ , USDA Cir.939. U.S. Washington.
- Prakash, C. Shivram, R. K. and Koli, N.R. (2013). Bioefficacy of penoxsulan against broad spectrum weed control in transplanted rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*, 45(4):228-230.
- Payman, G. and Singh, S. (2008). Effect of seed rate, spacing and herbicide use on weed management in direct seeded upland rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Indian J. of Weed Sci.*, 40 (1& 2): 11-15.
- Rao, A.S., Ratnam, M. and Reddy, T.Y. (2008). Weed Management in Direct-seeded Semi Dry Rice. *Indian J. Weed Sci.*, 40 (3 & 4): 153-156.
- Singh, Y., Singh, V.P., Singh, G., Yadav, D.S., Sinha, R.K.P., Johnson, D.E. and Mortimer, A.M. (2011). The implication of land preparation, crop establishment method and weed management on rice yield variation in the rice wheat system in the Indo-Gangetic plains. *Field Crops Res.*, 121:64-74.
- Singh, V.P., Singh, S.P., Kumar, A. and Singh, M.K. (2007). Resource conservation through direct seeding rice and zero tillage of wheat in the Indo-Gangetic Plains, IRRI.
- Sirazuddin, Singh, S.P., Singh, V.P. and Mahapatra, B.S. (2015). Effect of establishment methods and weed control measures on broad leaf weeds, yield attributes and harvest index of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *International Journal of Engineering Research and Science*, 1(6):34-37.
- Subbiah, B.V. and Asija, G.L. (1956). A rapid procedure for the estimation of available N in the soils. *Current Science*, 25: 259

Received: October 23, 2020

Accepted: December 17, 2020