



# Effect of Sequential Application of Herbicides on Weed Management, Productivity and Nutrient Uptake of Direct Seeded Rice

Devi Lal Dhaker, Birendra Kumar, Rayapati Karthik and Manish Raj

Department of Agronomy, Bihar Agricultural University, Sabour, Bhagalpur- 813 210, India  
E-mail: [devilal.dhaker09@gmail.com](mailto:devilal.dhaker09@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The investigation was carried out at Bihar Agricultural University, Sabour, Bhagalpur (Bihar) during *kharif*, 2018 to find the impact of chemical weed management on complex weed flora and productivity of direct seeded rice. The dominant weeds in field were *Cyperus rotundus*, *Echinochloa spp*, *Eleusine indica* and *Caesulia axillaries*. The lowest weed population, dry weight, highest percent weed control efficiency and productivity of rice were recorded by the hand weeding treatment. Among all the herbicidal treatments, the lowest weeds count, weeds dry weight and highest percent weed control efficiency, high productivity and nutrient uptake of rice were recorded under treatment pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb pyrazosulfuron @ 20 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> + bispyribac-Na @ 20 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> at POE which can be recommended to the farmers.

**Keywords:** Weed flora, Direct seeded rice, Weed population, Weed control efficiency, Nutrient uptake

Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) is the staple food for more than 60% of the world population, providing energy for about 40% of the world population where every third person on earth consumes rice every day in one form or other (Datta and Khushi 2002). Among several reasons for low rice productivity, the losses due to weeds are one of the most important. Weeds are most severe and widespread biological constraints to crop production in India and weeds alone cause 33% of losses out of total losses due to pests (Verma et al 2015). Direct-seeded rice (DSR) has several advantages over puddled transplanted rice like easier planting, timely sowing, less drudgery, early crop maturity by 7-10 days, less water requirement, better soil physical condition for next crop and low production cost and more profit (Kumar and Ladha, 2011). DSR is severely affected by weed population in *kharif* season which indicates that timely management of weeds is essential for better performance. In the initial stages of the crop, weeds can be effectively controlled by pre-emergence herbicides. However, in later stages of crop, weeds can obstruct the growth and development of crop. Therefore, the present experiment was conducted to find out the effective herbicides or herbicide mixtures for weed control in direct seeded rice.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted at Agriculture research farm, Bihar Agricultural University, Sabour, Bhagalpur, Bihar (longitude 87°2'42" East and latitude 25°15'40" North at

altitude of 46 meters above *mean* sea level in the heart of the vast Indo-Gangetic plains of North India) during *Kharif* season of 2018. The soil of the experimental site was loamy sand in texture having normal soil reaction (pH 7.27) and electrical conductivity (0.27 dSm<sup>-1</sup>), low in organic carbon (0.46%) & available N (180.61 kg/ha) and medium in available P (22.65 kg/ha) and K (206.88 kg/ha). The experiment comprised of 11 weed management practices (Table 1). The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with three replications. Rice variety '*Sabour Sampannadhan*' (BRR0059) was sown on 16<sup>th</sup> June 2018 using tractor drawn conventional drill with seed rate of 30 kg /ha in rows spaced at 20 cm. The recommended dose of fertilizers and plant protection measures for insect-pest and disease control were applied. The data on weed density were transformed using square root transformation. Yield and yield attributes were recorded at the time of harvesting.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Weed population:** Hand weeding treatments shown significantly lower weeds at all growth stages over rest of the treatments the main reason behind this is timely uprooting of weed species. The significantly higher weed population was obtained in weedy check at 15, 30, 45 and 60 DAS which was significantly superior compared to rest of the treatments at all of the crop growth stages. It was mainly due to uninterrupted growth of all the three types of weeds. This is in conformity with the findings of Chauhan (2013). Among the herbicide

applied treatments at 15, 30, 45 and 60 DAS, the minimum weed population of total weeds was recorded. Among the all herbicidal treatments, the minimum weed population was recorded under T<sub>5</sub> (pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb bispyribac-Na @ 20 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> + pyrazosulfuron @ 20 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> POE) which was at par with T<sub>4</sub> (pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb bispyribac-Na @ 25 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> POE). This is probably because of capability of the herbicide to impact the cell division, cell growth and competition among the weeds and crop might have resulted in death of some weeds. Herbicidal mixtures decreased the weed density compared to the either solo application of pre or post emergence herbicides. The significant effect of herbicides in combination with hand weeding can be ascribed to the broad spectrum weed control as the herbicides have controlled specific weeds. These results are in conformity with the findings of Tiwari et al (2013).

**Weed dry weight:** Among the all herbicidal treatments, the minimum weed dry weight (4.91 g m<sup>-2</sup>) was under T<sub>1</sub> (pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> PE) at 15 days after sowing and which was statistically at par with T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>, and T<sub>5</sub>. The maximum dry weight (7.53 g m<sup>-2</sup>) of weed was d with T<sub>9</sub> (halosulfuron @ 67.5 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> + azimsulfuron @ 30 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> POE). In rest of the growth stages (30, 45 and 60 DAS), the minimum weed dry weight was obtained under T<sub>5</sub> which was statistically at par with T<sub>4</sub> and was significantly superior over

rest of the treatments. The maximum dry weight of total was obtained with T<sub>2</sub> (pendimethalin @ 1000 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> PE). The application of herbicides can be attributed to their efficacy to control wide spectrum of weeds. The integration of herbicides which resulted in broad spectrum weed control over the other treatments was because pre emergence herbicides eliminated the early emerged weeds and post emergence herbicides controlled the later germinated weeds which resulted in lowest weed population as well as weed dry weight. These results are in conformity with the findings of Patel et al. (2018) where application of pyrazosulfuron-ethyl 25 g ha<sup>-1</sup> fb bispyribac-sodium salt 50 g ha<sup>-1</sup> at 30 DAS suppressed the weed population and dry weight over control.

Among herbicide applied treatments, the highest WCE was recorded (84.88%) under T<sub>5</sub> at 45 days after sowing whereas minimum WCE (61.94%) was obtained with treatment T<sub>2</sub>. The maximum WCE was obtained (87.09%) under T<sub>5</sub> treatment at 60 days after sowing and minimum weed control efficiency (69.00 per cent) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>2</sub>. The reducing trend of WCE is because of the decrease of weed dry matter in herbicides treated with advancement of time which is due to decrease in weed dry matter over rest of the weed treatment. The highest WCE with hand weeding was also observed by Singh et al (2014).

Among the different weed treatment, the lowest weed index (1.69%) was with the treatment T<sub>5</sub> followed by T<sub>4</sub>

**Table 1.** Effect of chemical weed management practices on total weed population (no. m<sup>-2</sup>) at various crop growth stages of direct seeded rice

Treatments	Description	15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS	60 DAS
T <sub>1</sub>	Pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> PE	5.87 (34.03)	7.66 (58.23)	8.48 (71.42)	7.78 (60.05)
T <sub>2</sub>	Pendimethalin @ 1000 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> PE	6.04 (35.93)	7.98 (63.25)	9.02 (80.94)	8.31 (68.59)
T <sub>3</sub>	Pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> PE fb 2,4-DEE @ 750 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> POE	6.48 (41.44)	6.98 (48.32)	8.41 (70.30)	7.71 (58.98)
T <sub>4</sub>	Pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> PE fb bispyribac-Na @ 25 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> POE	6.34 (39.82)	5.76 (32.70)	6.63 (43.42)	5.42 (28.92)
T <sub>5</sub>	Pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> PE fb bispyribac-Na @ 20 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> + pyrazosulfuron @ 20 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> POE	6.22 (38.26)	5.41 (29.02)	6.20 (38.05)	5.13 (25.90)
T <sub>6</sub>	Bispyribac-Na @ 25 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> POE	8.58 (73.10)	7.28 (52.54)	8.21 (66.95)	7.48 (55.57)
T <sub>7</sub>	Bispyribac sodium @ 20 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> . + pyrazosulfuron @ 20 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> POE	8.56 (72.64)	6.86 (46.52)	7.64 (57.91)	6.81 (46.0)
T <sub>8</sub>	Ethoxsulfuron @ 15 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> + pyrazosulfuron @ 20 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> POE	8.87 (78.27)	7.15 (50.64)	7.91 (62.09)	7.06 (49.34)
T <sub>9</sub>	Halosulfuron @ 67.5 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> + azimsulfuron @ 30 g a.i. ha <sup>-1</sup> POE	8.55 (72.64)	6.42 (40.67)	7.11 (50.22)	6.14 (37.46)
T <sub>10</sub>	Hand weeding (15,30 and 45 DAS)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)
T <sub>11</sub>	Weed check	9.61 (91.16)	11.16 (124.07)	12.24 (149.29)	11.57 (133.41)
CD (p=0.05)		(0.39)	(0.43)	(0.51)	(0.54)

Data in parenthesis were transformed to  $\sqrt{x} + 0.5$  before analysis. The figures in parentheses are the original values

(7.58%) weed management practices. Improved WCE and season long broad-spectrum control of these weed management practices bring about in reduced weed index significantly. These results were supported by Maity and Mukherjee (2008). At the maturity stage, among all herbicides treatments the significantly maximum number of effective tillers ( $293.7 \text{ m}^{-2}$ ) were in  $T_5$  which was at par with  $T_4$ ,  $T_9$ ,  $T_7$  and  $T_6$  and minimum number of effective tillers were recorded in  $T_2$  ( $236.7 \text{ m}^{-2}$ ). Irrespective of growth stages, significantly the maximum number of tillers of rice was observed in hand weeding ( $T_{10}$ ) and minimum number of tillers was observed in weedy check ( $T_{11}$ ). Highest LAI was observed at 90 DAS in the hand weeding treatment  $T_{10}$  (4.84) which were comparable with treatments viz,  $T_4$ ,  $T_5$ ,  $T_6$ ,  $T_7$  and  $T_9$  which was due to intercultural operations helping more

aeration of the soil. Minimum competition and better WCE which has led to well growth and development finally improved the LAI of the concerned treatments. Lowest LAI with weedy check was reported by Singh et al (2014). Among the herbicide applied treatments, maximum dry matter ( $1025.7 \text{ g m}^{-2}$ ) was obtained with  $T_5$  at maturity and minimum was with  $T_2$  ( $876.3 \text{ g m}^{-2}$ ). It is probably because of application of Pyrazosulfuron as a pre-emergence herbicide and in combination with bispyribac-Na as a post emergence herbicide which resulted in greater reduction of weed population which in turn made the plant-weed competition lowest compared to rest of the treatments. This finding was in conformity with Ramachandran and Balasubramanian (2012).

Among all the herbicide applied treatments, the

**Table 2.** Effect of chemical weed management practices on total weed dry weight ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ) at various crop growth stages of direct seeded rice

Treatments	15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS	60 DAS
$T_1$	4.91 (23.62)	6.17 (37.56)	6.74 (44.87)	6.90 (47.05)
$T_2$	5.21 (26.61)	6.54 (42.32)	7.00 (48.57)	7.04 (49.02)
$T_3$	5.15 (26.13)	5.63 (31.31)	6.17 (40.94)	6.32 (39.50)
$T_4$	5.08 (25.37)	4.14 (16.70)	4.67 (21.56)	4.82 (24.88)
$T_5$	5.13 (25.91)	3.82 (14.17)	4.44 (19.29)	4.57 (20.42)
$T_6$	7.12 (50.18)	5.24 (26.93)	5.78 (32.92)	5.93 (34.70)
$T_7$	6.81 (45.83)	4.92 (24.04)	5.62 (30.98)	5.86 (33.90)
$T_8$	7.10 (49.98)	5.53 (30.31)	6.09 (36.65)	6.22 (38.22)
$T_9$	7.35 (53.59)	4.56 (19.94)	5.28 (27.37)	5.40 (28.72)
$T_{10}$	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)
$T_{11}$	8.47 (71.31)	11.23 (104.00)	11.32 (127.62)	12.68 (158.13)
CD (P=0.05)	0.32	0.40	0.24	0.27

See Table 1 for details .Data in parenthesis were transformed to  $\sqrt{x+0.5}$  before analysis. The figures in parentheses are the original values

**Table 3.** Effect of chemical weed management practices on weed index and weed control efficiency of direct seeded rice

Treatments	Weed index	Weed control efficiency (%)			
		15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS	60 DAS
$T_1$	34.48	66.88	63.88	64.83	70.25
$T_2$	36.39	62.68	59.31	61.94	69.00
$T_3$	29.13	63.36	69.89	70.55	75.02
$T_4$	7.58	64.42	83.94	81.54	84.27
$T_5$	1.69	63.67	86.38	84.88	87.09
$T_6$	22.75	29.63	74.11	74.20	78.06
$T_7$	18.06	35.73	76.88	75.65	78.56
$T_8$	28.42	29.91	70.86	71.28	75.83
$T_9$	15.06	24.85	80.83	78.55	81.84
$T_{10}$	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
$T_{11}$	50.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Table 4.** Effect of chemical weed management on growth and yield attributes at maturity of direct seeded rice

Treatments	Tillers (m <sup>-2</sup> ) at maturity	Leaf area Index at 90 DAS	Dry matter accumulation (g m <sup>-2</sup> ) at maturity	Grain yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Straw yield (t ha <sup>-1</sup> )
T <sub>1</sub>	251.7	4.41	878.7	3.60	4.99
T <sub>2</sub>	236.7	4.36	876.3	3.50	5.01
T <sub>3</sub>	258.3	4.38	907.7	3.90	5.26
T <sub>4</sub>	281.3	4.73	1002.0	5.08	6.35
T <sub>5</sub>	293.7	4.75	1025.7	5.41	6.67
T <sub>6</sub>	268.7	4.50	990.0	4.25	5.90
T <sub>7</sub>	273.0	4.69	992.7	4.51	6.06
T <sub>8</sub>	252.0	4.39	928.3	3.94	5.37
T <sub>9</sub>	278.7	4.66	998.7	4.67	6.20
T <sub>10</sub>	307.3	4.84	1058.0	5.50	6.69
T <sub>11</sub>	194.7	3.82	873.0	2.70	3.97
CD (p=0.05)	33.3	0.32	13.3	0.82	1.31

**Table 5.** Effect of chemical weed management practices on nutrient uptake by grain and straw in direct seeded rice

Treatments	Nitrogen kg ha <sup>-1</sup>			Phosphorous kg ha <sup>-1</sup>			Potassium kg ha <sup>-1</sup>		
	Grain	Straw	Total	Grain	Straw	Total	Grain	Straw	Total
T <sub>1</sub>	56.86	19.95	76.82	10.21	9.30	19.51	12.44	70.45	82.89
T <sub>2</sub>	55.49	19.96	75.45	9.99	9.41	19.41	12.07	69.49	81.56
T <sub>3</sub>	58.57	22.77	81.34	11.02	9.71	20.73	13.34	73.04	86.39
T <sub>4</sub>	75.01	23.01	98.02	14.54	11.81	26.36	17.59	88.92	106.98
T <sub>5</sub>	78.34	25.33	103.67	15.48	12.45	27.93	18.77	94.26	110.03
T <sub>6</sub>	66.64	23.02	89.66	12.23	11.08	23.31	14.69	81.89	96.58
T <sub>7</sub>	68.93	22.72	91.65	12.85	11.24	24.08	15.57	84.19	99.76
T <sub>8</sub>	55.46	22.56	78.02	11.19	10.04	21.23	13.59	74.35	87.94
T <sub>9</sub>	69.57	25.66	95.23	13.27	11.67	24.94	16.06	86.02	102.08
T <sub>10</sub>	80.09	28.26	108.35	15.57	12.48	28.05	18.96	92.37	111.34
T <sub>11</sub>	39.74	15.09	54.84	7.66	7.29	14.96	9.32	56.32	65.65
CD (p=0.05)	12.30	4.88	15.15	2.39	2.29	3.54	2.82	17.95	18.57

significantly higher grain yield of (5.41 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) was produced with T<sub>5</sub> which was significant at par T<sub>4</sub> (5.08 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>9</sub> (4.67 t ha<sup>-1</sup>). The increased grain yield in these treatments is because of weed density and better WCE along with betterment in yield attributes like number of effective tillers per m<sup>2</sup>, panicles length, number of grains per panicle and test grain weight. This corroborates with the findings of Singh et al (2005). The treatment T<sub>5</sub> obtained significantly higher straw yield of (6.69 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) which was at par with T<sub>4</sub>, T<sub>6</sub>, T<sub>7</sub>, T<sub>8</sub> and T<sub>9</sub>. The minimum straw yield was recorded in T<sub>11</sub> (3.97 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) (weedy check). Similar findings were observed by Pratap et al (2017).

**Nutrient uptake:** Among the different treatments, maximum uptake of 108.35, 28.05 and 111.34 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> N, P and K respectively was observed with hand weeded plot. The

lowest N, P and P uptake was recorded in weedy check plots. The high uptake of nutrients is because of less crop weed competition along with higher nutrient absorption which has led to in higher N, P and K content in grain and straw. Among all herbicidal treatments, the higher value of N (103.67 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), P (27.93 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and K (110.03 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was registered in T<sub>5</sub> followed by T<sub>4</sub>.

## CONCLUSION

Weed management in direct seeded rice is very difficult because of presence of complex weed flora. Usage of herbicidal combinations could be the solution as it controls the all types of weeds effectively and prevents the development of herbicide resistance in weeds. This study was carried out to find the suitable herbicidal combinations in

direct seed rice as research on herbicidal combinations in direct seeded rice in India are limited. Based on findings of investigation for one year, it may be concluded that application of pyrazosulfuron @ 25 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb bispyribac-Na @ 20 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> + pyrazosulfuron @ 20 g a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> PoE was equally effective to hand weeding thrice in controlling the weeds, improved yield and economically viable option in DSR.

#### REFERENCES

- Chauhan BS 2013. Shade reduces growth and seed production of *Echinochloa colona* L., *Echinochloa crus-galli* L., and *Echinochloa glabrescens* L. *Crop Protection* **43**: 241-245.
- Chauhan BS, Singh VP, Kumar A and Johnson DE 2011. Relations of rice seeding rates to crop and weed growth in aerobic rice. *Field crops research* **121**(1): 105-115.
- Datta SK and Khushi GS 2002. Improving rice to meet food and nutrient needs: Biotechnological approaches. *Journal of Crop Production* **6**: 229-247.
- Kumar V and Ladha JK 2011. Direct-seeding of rice: Recent developments and future research needs. *Advances in Agronomy* **111**: 297-413.
- Maity SK and Mukherjee PK 2008. Integrated weed management in dry direct seeded rainy season rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Indian Journal Agronomy* **53**: 116-20.
- Patel TU, Lodaya DH, Italiya AP, Patel DD and Patel HH 2018. Bio-efficacy of herbicides in direct-seeded rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **50**(2): 120-123.
- Pratap T, Singh VP and Rekha 2017. Chemical control of weeds in dry-seeded rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **49**(1): 98-99.
- Ramachandran K and Balasubramanian R 2012. Efficacy of herbicides for weed control in aerobic rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **44**(2): 118-121.
- Singh R, Pal R, Singh T, Singh AP, Yadav S, and Singh J 2014. Management of weeds in direct-seeded rice by bispyribac-sodium. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **46**(2): 126-128.
- Singh VP, Singh G, Singh RK, Singh SP, Kumar A, Dhyani VC, Kumar M and Sharma G 2005. Effect of Herbicides Alone and in Combination on Direct Seeded Rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* **37**(3 & 4): 197-201.
- Tiwari RB, Pandey TD, Sharma G and Chaure NK 2013. Effect of weed control measures on yield, weed control, economics and energetic of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) cropping system. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **58**(4): 465-468.
- Verma SK, Singh SB, Meena RN, Prasad SK, Meena RS and Gaurav 2015. A review of weed management in India: The need of new directions for sustainable agriculture. *The Bioscan* **10**(1): 253-263.

---

Received 06 July, 2022; Accepted 22 October, 2022