

Original Research Article

EFFECT OF NON-CHEMICAL ECO-FRIENDLY WEED MANAGEMENT APPROACHES ON YIELD AND NUTRIENT UPTAKE IN HIGH DENSITY PLANTING COTTON IN VERTISOL OF NORTHERN KARNATAKA

Abstract:

Field experiment was conducted in 2017 and 2018 at Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, UAS, Raichur with an objective to study the effect of non-chemical eco-friendly weed management approaches on yield, nutrient uptake and balance in soil of high density planting cotton in deep vertisols. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Completely Block Design with three replications. There were 14 treatments imposed viz., polythene mulch, paddy straw mulch, cotton stalk mulch, intercropping with green manures at 1:1 ratio (Sunnhemp and Cowpea), four different botanicals extracts @ 20% as PE (*Eucalyptus sp.*, *Prosopis juliflora* extract, *Cassia tora* and *Parthenium hysterophorus*), mechanical, cultural and their combination compared with weed free check, unweeded control and recommended practice. The experiment was carried out in a randomized complete block design replicated thrice. The two years pooled data results registered that, weed free check has recorded significantly greater seed cotton yield (1372 kg ha^{-1}) over rest of the treatments. It was followed by Cotton + Sunnhemp (1:1) subsequently *in-situ* mulching at 45 DAS (1299 kg ha^{-1}), pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i./ha as PE fb pyriproxyfen sodium 10 EC 75 g a.i./ha + quizalofop ethyl 37.5 g a.i./ha at 25 DAS as PoE (1274 kg ha^{-1}) and black polythene sheet mulch (1262 kg ha^{-1}) with lower nutrient uptake over weedy check. The eco-friendly treatments viz., cotton + Sunnhemp (1:1) and *in-situ* mulching at 45 DAS, mulching with black polythene sheet, Cotton + Cowpea (1:1) and *in-situ* mulching at 45 DAS were at par with weed free check and they might be recommended as these were the best options.

Key words: HDPS (High density planting system), Nutrient uptake and Seed cotton yield

Comment [H1]: Change title as "EFFECT OF NON-CHEMICAL ECO-FRIENDLY WEED MANAGEMENT APPROACHES ON YIELD AND NUTRIENT UPTAKE IN COTTON UNDER HIGH DENSITY PLANTING IN VERTISOL OF NORTHERN KARNATAKA"

Comment [H2]: Mention season

Comment [H3]: Nutrient uptake in what?

Comment [H4]: This is not there in the text or table so delete

Comment [H5]: Delete and insert 'in cotton under'

Comment [H6]: delete

Comment [H7]: Delete as it is repeated after treatments

Comment [H8]: "It was on par with"

Comment [H9]: By what?

Comment [H10]: It is not on par with weed free check

Introduction:

Cotton (*Gossypium sp.*) is popularly known as “the white gold or the king of fibre crops” is an important commercial fibre crop grown under diverse agro-climatic conditions around the world. Karnataka stands eighth in cotton area (5.46 lakh ha) and seventh in production with (18.0 lakh bales) with an average productivity of 560 kg lint ha⁻¹ (Anon., 2018). Among different agronomic manipulations that would influence the productivity of cotton, management of weeds is considered to be an important step for achieving higher productivity (Manalil *et al.*, 2017). Weeds primarily compete for nutrients, moisture and sunlight during the early crop growth period than at later stage. Weeds consume 5 to 6 times of nitrogen, 5 to 12 times of phosphorus and 2 to 5 times of potash more than cotton crop at the early growth stages (Mahar *et al.*, 2007) and could be very destructive for cotton production systems. The critical period of weed competition in cotton was found to be 15 to 60 days (Sharma, 2008). Thus, if proper weed control measures are followed, there would be greater availability of nutrients and moisture for the benefit of crop. Manual weed management practice is laborious and expensive. In spite of herbicides being effective in increasing yield, indiscriminate use of herbicides has resulted in serious ecological implications such as development of herbicide resistance weeds and shifts in weed population. Recently, research attention has been focused on to find out alternative strategies for chemical weed control in several crops. Reduction in herbicide use is one of major goals of modern agriculture and there is much emphasis on search for alternative weed management strategies that are cheap, safe and sustainable.

So, the extracts from the different plants which are having less residual effect compared to chemicals used to control the weeds. And farmers look for selective post emergence broad spectrum herbicide /herbicide mixtures. Extracts are considered as an effective, economical and environment friendly/eco-friendly weed management approach. The slow initial growth coupled with indeterminate growth habit favours the growing of intercrops without affecting yield of cotton. Intercropping has unique capacity to raise the unit profitability without disturbing the cotton ecosystem. Intercropping is the growing of two or more crops simultaneously in the alternative rows on the same piece of land in order to utilize available resources efficiently and obtaining more production per unit area (Lithourgidis *et al.*, 2011). Two crops differing in rooting ability, nutrient requirements, height and canopy grow simultaneously with least competition (Lithourgidis *et al.*, 2006). Weed density and biomass may substantially be reduced through intercropping (Poggio, 2005). Singh *et al.* (2003) indicated that growing companion plants, which are selectively

Comment [H11]: Latest figures may be written

Comment [H12]: Is it Resistant or resistance

allelopathic to weeds, may provide a cost effective alternative to the use of synthetic chemicals. This study was conducted to study effect of non-chemical eco-friendly weed management approaches on yield, nutrient uptake and balance in soil of high density planting cotton in deep *vertisols*.

Comment [H13]: By what?

Comment [H14]: ??

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experiment was conducted for two consecutive years 2017-18 and 2018-19 at Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, UAS, Raichur. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Completely Block Design with three replications. Fourteen treatments comprised of Mulching with black polythene, Mulching with cotton stalk at 5 t/ha, Mulching with paddy straw at 5 t/ha, Cotton + Sunnhemp (1:1) and *insitu* mulching at 45 DAS, Cotton + Cowpea (1:1) and *insitu* mulching at 45 DAS. Weeding with cycle weeder at 25, 50 and 75 DAS, HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS, *Eucalyptus sp.* extract @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS., *Prosopis juliflora* extract @ 20% as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS., *Cassia tora* @ 20% as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS., *Parthenium hysterophorus* extract 20% as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS, pendimethalin 38.7 C S @ 680 g a.i./ha as PE fb pyriethion sodium 10EC 75 g a.i./ha + quizalofop ethyl 37.5 g a.i./ha at 25 DAS as PoE, Weed free check and Unweeded control. The recommended dose of fertilizer and spacing for cotton was 80:40:40 NPK kg/ha and 60 cm x 20 cm respectively maintained for all the treatments. Treatments such as polythene sheet mulch, cotton stalk mulch and paddy straw mulch were mulched at the time of sowing, intercropping with sunnhemp and cowpea were grown and in situ mulched at 45 DAS and other herbicide chemicals are used as pre-emergence and post-emergence as per the treatment details. The fresh leaves of botanicals such as, *Eucalyptus sp.*, *Prosopis juliflora*, *Cassia tora* and *Parthenium hysterophorus* cut into small species, soaked in alcohol and water @ 1:1 proportion and kept for overnight. After 12 hours, soaked leaves were ground with the help of mixer grinder. From the paste, the leaf extract of each botanical species was prepared by filtration which represented 100 per cent stock solution. From the stock solution, 20 per cent concentration was prepared and sprayed as per the treatment schedule. The weed samples collected for estimation of dry matter production at maturity used for nutrient analysis. The crop samples were ground using Willey mill and used for estimation of N, P and K to work out uptake of major nutrients.

Comment [H15]: during kharif

Comment [H16]: ??

Nutrient uptake (kg ha^{-1})

Nitrogen content (%) in the plant and weed samples was estimated by the micro Kjeldahl method using Kelplus N analyser after digesting the samples with H_2SO_4 and H_2O_2 (Piper, 1966). For phosphorus estimation, the tri-acid (HNO_3 , HClO_4 and H_2SO_4) in the ratio of (9:3:1) respectively digested plant and weed samples were analyzed by Vanado-molybdo phosphoric acid. The intensity of yellow colour developed was measured by using spectrophotometer at 420 nm (Piper, 1966). Potassium content in the tri-acid was determined with flame photometer (Piper, 1966).

Comment [H17]: The

Nutrient uptake = Nitrogen / phosphorus / potassium of plant parts / weeds x weight of seed cotton yield (kg ha^{-1}) / weeds weight

Data analysis

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the randomized complete block design was performed to determine the effect of time and rate of application of herbicides on weed species, lit yield and nutrient uptake by weeds and crop. If the ANOVA for the multi-year combined data showed a significant effect between treatments and years, a separate ANOVA was conducted for each individual year by using SAS 9.3 (SAS Inst., Cary, NC, USA 2008) was used for all analyses.

Comment [H18]: ??

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Weed Flora at experimental site

The weed flora observed in both the soils was recorded. In the red soil, among the grasses *Cynodon dactylon*, *Rottboellia exaltata*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* and *Dinebraretro flexa* were noticed. *Cyperus rotundus* was the only sedge present in the field. Among the broad leaved weeds, *Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Euphorbia geniculata*, *Trianthema portulaca strum*, *Trichodesma indica*, *Commelina benghalensis*, *Digera arvensis*, *Tridax procumbens*, and *Phyllanthus niruri* were observed in the field. In the black soil, among the grasses *Cynodon dactylon*, *Rottboellia exaltata* and *Echinochloa colonum*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* were noticed. *Cyperus rotundus* was the only sedge present in the field. Among the broad leaved weeds, *Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Euphorbia geniculata*, *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Trichodesma indica*, *Cyanotis cristata*, *Digera arvensis* and *Celosia argentea* were observed in the field. Weeds compete with the crops for moisture, nutrients, light and CO_2 and there by affect the yield.

Comment [H19]: The heading is weed flora at experimental site i.e., vertisols and not red soils. This may be deleted

Thus the nutrient uptake by crop is an important factor to be determined to know the effect of the control practices.

Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium nutrient uptake (kg ha^{-1}) by weeds

Comment [H20]: Delete

Nitrogen uptake by weeds

A result indicated that weed free check recorded significantly lower over rest of the treatments. Among other treatments, application of pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha^{-1} as PE fb pyriithiobac sodium 10 EC @ 75 g a.i. ha^{-1} + quizolofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha^{-1} at 25 DAS as POE (4.2 kg ha^{-1}), cotton + sunnhemp (1:1) and then *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS (4.6 kg ha^{-1}), cotton + cowpea (1:1) and then *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS (5.1 kg ha^{-1}), weeding with cycle weeder at 25, 50 and 75 DAS (5.9 kg ha^{-1}) and HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS (5.4 kg ha^{-1}) recorded significantly lower nitrogen uptake over unweeded control.

Comment [H21]: Indicate Pooled result

Phosphorus uptake by weeds

The treatment, weed free check recorded significantly, lower phosphorus removal by weeds (0 kg ha^{-1}) as compared to unweeded control. Application of pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha^{-1} as PE fb pyriithiobac sodium 10 EC @ 75 g a.i. ha^{-1} + quizolofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha^{-1} at 25 DAS as POE, black polythene sheet mulch, cotton + sunnhemp (1:1) and then *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS, cotton + cowpea (1:1) and *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS, weeding with cycle weeder at 25, 50 and 75 DAS and HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS recorded significantly lower phosphorus uptake (0.6, 0.8, 0.7, 0.7, 0.8 and 0.7 kg ha^{-1} , respectively) over unweeded control (2.8 kg ha^{-1}).

Comment [H22]: Its 2.9 kg ha^{-1} as per table

Potassium uptake by weeds

Potassium uptake by the weeds was as that of nitrogen and phosphorus. Application of pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha^{-1} as PE fb pyriithiobac sodium 10 EC @ 75 g a.i. ha^{-1} + quizolofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha^{-1} at 25 DAS as POE, black polythene sheet mulching, cotton + sunnhemp (1:1) and *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS, cotton + cowpea (1:1) and then *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS, weeding with cycle weeder at 25, 50 and 75 DAS and HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS (5.9, 6.6, 6.2, 6.5, 7.2 and 7.1 kg ha^{-1} , respectively) were on par with each other and superior over unweeded control (20.4 kg ha^{-1}).

Among the weed management practices, the reduction in nutrient removal by weeds was recorded in weed free check and was followed by combined application of pendimethalin 680 g *a.i.*/ha⁻¹ at early stages of crop growth followed by *fb* pyriproxyfen sodium 10 EC @75 g *a.i.* ha⁻¹ + quizalofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g *a.i.* ha⁻¹ at 25 DAS as POE. This might be due to fairly weed free condition at early stages of crop growth and the weed free environment created by the PE and POE application of herbicides that reduced dry matter production of weeds. These findings are in line with the reports of Sathishkumar (2016). Among the mulching treatments, black polythene sheet mulch, intercropping and *in situ* mulching of green manures also had lower nutrient removal by weeds compared to unweeded control. The reduced uptake of nutrients by weeds was due to efficient control of predominant grasses, sedges and broad leaved weeds by shade and also by suppressing weeds by reducing competition for natural resources such as light, water, nutrients and applied nutrients for their better growth. This weed free environment at critical stages helped

cotton to exhibit the vigorous growth, subsequently in all the critical stages supported the crop to produce more DMP and suppressed weed in the later stages of crop growth. The removal of weeds during later period by hand weeding has resulted higher WCE and lesser nutrient uptake by weeds. But maximum removal of nutrients by weeds was noticed in unweeded control. Higher uptake of nutrients by weeds under control was due to high weed density and more weed dry weight accumulation corroborating with earlier findings of Malarkodi (2013). The higher nutrient uptake by weeds might be due to the higher weed intensity and biomass in unweeded control treatment and its dominance in utilizing sunlight, moisture and CO₂ over plants resulting in accumulation of more dry matter by weeds and there by absorption of nutrients from soil and reduced nutrient uptake of weeds was due to less weed dry matter in the respective treatments. These results were in close conformity with the findings of Anjum *et al.* (2007) and Veeramani *et al.* (2008) (Table 1).

Nutrient uptake (kg ha⁻¹) by cotton

Nitrogen uptake by cotton

The pooled data indicated that, under weed free check (106.0 kg ha⁻¹), cotton utilized significantly higher uptake of nitrogen under weed free check (106.0 kg ha⁻¹).

Comment [H23]: Delete

Comment [H24]: Delete

over other treatments. While, the other treatments viz., application of herbicides pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha⁻¹ as PE *fb* pyriithiobac sodium 10 EC @ 75 g a.i. ha⁻¹ + quizolofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha⁻¹ at 25 DAS as PoE (94.1 kg ha⁻¹), cotton + sunnhemp (1:1) and *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS (93.9 kg ha⁻¹), cotton + cowpea (1:1) and *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS (90.4 kg ha⁻¹), black polythene sheet mulch (88.8 kg ha⁻¹) and HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS (88.3 kg ha⁻¹) were on par with each other but significantly superior over unweeded control.

Phosphorus uptake by cotton

Significantly higher phosphorus uptake by cotton was noticed in weed free check (13.0 kg ha⁻¹) compared to rest of the treatments. This was ~~recorded~~ followed by the application

of pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha⁻¹ as PE *fb* pyriithiobac sodium 10 EC @ 75 g a.i. ha⁻¹ + quizolofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha⁻¹ at 25 DAS as PoE (11.4 kg ha⁻¹), cotton + sunnhemp (1:1) and then *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS (10.8 kg ha⁻¹), cotton + cowpea (1:1) and then *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS (10.5 kg ha⁻¹), black polythene mulch and HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS (10.4 kg ha⁻¹) and among these, there was no significant difference but were superior over unweeded control (6.5 kg ha⁻¹).

Comment [H25]: It is 10.5

Potassium uptake by cotton

The higher uptake of potassium by cotton was recorded in weed free check (95.3 kg ha⁻¹) over other treatments. Application of pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha⁻¹ as PE *fb* pyriithiobac sodium 10 EC @ 75 g a.i. ha⁻¹ + quizolofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha⁻¹ at 25 DAS as POE (84.9 kg ha⁻¹), cotton + sunnhemp (82.1 kg ha⁻¹) and cowpea (1:1) (79.7 kg ha⁻¹) and then *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS black polythene mulch (72.3 kg ha⁻¹) and HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS (79.0 kg ha⁻¹) were on par with each other but significantly superior over unweeded control.

Nutrient uptake (N, P and K) by cotton was greatly influenced by weed control treatments as compared to control. Weed free check treatment recorded the highest nutrient uptake as there were no weeds present and there was no competition. Among other treatments, pendimethalin @ 680 g a.i. ha⁻¹ PE and pyriithiobac sodium @ 75 g a.i. ha⁻¹ + quizalofop ethyl 37.5 g a.i. ha⁻¹ (94.1 kg N ha⁻¹, 11.4 kg P ha⁻¹ and 84.9 kg K ha⁻¹) was found to be more efficient. Among eco-friendly practices, intercropping and then *in*

situ mulching of sunnhemp and cowpea, black polythene mulch also showed higher uptake. The uptake of major nutrients by the crop was function of the crop dry matter production, nutrient availability and nutrient concentration of plants. Hence in these treatments due to minimum weed competition throughout the crop period facilitated higher dry matter production and nutrient uptake by the crop (Nalayini *et al.*, 2001). The lower ~~soil~~ N, P and K uptake status was recorded under unweeded control might be due higher weed populations thus reflected more depletion of nutrients by weeds in soil *i.e.* competition for applied nutrients between the weed and crop, which lowers the availability of nutrients to the crop and in turn reduces the growth, yield attributes and yield of the crop. This ultimately resulted in lower nutrient uptake. Similar observation was recorded by Madavi (2016) (Table 2).

Seed cotton yield

The pooled data revealed that significantly greater seed cotton yield (1372 kg ha^{-1}) in weed free check. The ~~in~~ cotton + sunnhemp (1:1) subsequently *in-situ* mulching at 45 DAS (1299 kg ha^{-1}), pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i./ha as PE fb pyriethion sodium 10 EC 75 g a.i./ha + quizalofop ethyl 37.5 g a.i./ha at 25 DAS as POE (1274 kg ha^{-1}) and black polythene sheet mulch (1262 kg ha^{-1}) ~~and~~ were on par with weed free check. These treatments were on par with each other and superior over unweeded control (917 kg ha^{-1}). Significantly higher yield, growth components in ~~this~~ these treatments was mainly attributed to occurrence of less competition between cotton plants and weeds for nutrients which ~~leads~~ led to more growth and yield attributes (Nalini, 2010). Black polythene mulch controlled the weeds by interrupting the light reaching the weeds and thus reduced the weed intensity and the benefit was witnessed (Nalini, 2007) (Table 3).

Conclusion

The macronutrient contents in cotton crop were higher in weed free check and this was comparable to cotton + sunnhemp (1:1) or cotton + cowpea (1:1) and *in situ* mulching at 45 DAS and mulching with black polythene (1262 Kg ha^{-1}), were ideal for minimum weed competition facilitated higher DMP and nutrient uptake by the plant in HDPS cotton. Among the leaf extract spray, pre emergence application of *Eucalyptus* extract @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS registered significantly lesser weed density, dry weight, nutrient uptake and higher seed cotton yield when compared to control and was on par with other leaf extractants.

Formatted: Superscript

Comment [H26]: Clarity is required and there is no mention of nutrient uptake by weeds and crop

UNDER PEER REVIEW

References

- Anjum, F. H., Tanveer, A., Tahir, M., Nadeem, M. A. and Ali, A., 2007, Growth and yield response of *Gossypium hirsutum* to plant spacing and *Trianthema portulacastrum* density. *Int. J. Agri. Biol.*, 9 (4): 559-563.
- Anonymous, 2018. ICAR-Central Institute for Cotton Research statewide cotton area, production and productivity. www.cicr.org.in/database/dbcapp5.html.
- Lithourgidis, A. S., Dordas, C. A., Damalas, C. A. and Vlachostergios, D. N., 2011, Annual intercrops: an alternative pathway for sustainable agriculture. *Australian J. Crop Sci.*, 5 (4): 396-410.
- Lithourgidis, A. S., Vasilakoglou, I. B., Dhima, K. V., Dordas, C. A. and Yiakoulaki, M. D., 2006, Silage yield and quality of common vetch mixtures with oat and triticale in two seeding ratios. *Field Crops Res.*, 99: 106-113.
- Madavi, B., Leela Rani, P., Sreenivas, G., Madhavi, A. and Surekha, K., 2017, Impact of high density planting and weed management practices on yield attributes, yield and quality characters of Bt. Cotton. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.*, 6 (8): 194-202.
- Mahar, G. M., Oad, F. C., Buriro, U. A. and Solangi, G. S., 2007. Effect of post-emergence herbicide on the yield of up- land cotton. *Asian J. Plant Sci.*, 6 (8): 1282-1286
- Malarkodi, N., 2013, Study on integrated weed management involving botanicals in irrigated cotton. Ph.D., Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agric. Univ., Agric. College and Res. Institute, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India.
- Manalil S, Coast O, Werth J, Chauhana B.S. 2017. Weed management in cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) through weed-crop competition: A review. *Crop Prot.* 95: 53-59.
- Nalayini, P., 2007, Poly mulching – a case study to increase cotton productivity. Model training course on cultivation of long staple cotton (ELS), December 15-22, Central Institute for Cotton Research, Regional Station, Coimbatore. pp:183-189

Comment [H27]: In results it is 2016

- Nalayini, P., Kandasamy, O. S. and Kailasam, 2001, Recharge growth model for interspecific cotton hybrid as influenced by N level and weed control methods. *Crops Res.*, 22: 370-374.
- Nalini, K., 2010, Evaluation of pre-emergence herbicide in winter irrigated cotton and its residual effect on succeeding crops. Ph.D., Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agric. Univ., Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.
- Piper C. S., 1966. Soil and Plant Analysis. Hans Publisher, Bombay.
- Poggio, S. L., 2005, Structure of weed communities occurring in monoculture and intercropping of pea and barley. *Agri. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 109 (1-2): 48-58.
- Sathishkumar, A., 2016, Studies on the allelopathic effect of intercrops and tree leaf extracts on eco-friendly weed management in irrigated cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). Thesis, Tamil Nadu Agric. Univ., Agric. College and Res. Institute, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India.
- Sharma R. 2008. Integrated weed management in field crops. *Crop Care*. 35: 41-46.
- Singh, H. P., Batish, D. R. and Kohli, R. K., 2003, Allelopathic interactions and allelochemicals: new possibilities for sustainable weed management. *Crit. Rev. Plant Sci.*, 22: 239-311.
- Veeramani, A., Prema, P. and Ganesaraja, V., 2008, Pre and post-sowing control of weeds, their influence on nutrient uptake in summer irrigated cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.). *Res. J. Agri. Biological Sci.*, 4 (6): 643-646.

Table 1. Nitrogen, Phosphorus and potassium uptake by weeds as influenced by different non-chemical eco-friendly weed management practices in HDPS cotton

Treatment	N uptake (kg ha ⁻¹)			P uptake (kg ha ⁻¹)			K uptake (kg ha ⁻¹)		
	2017	2018	Pooled	2017	2018	Pooled	2017	2018	Pooled
Mulching with black polythene	4.6	6.2	5.4	0.7	0.9	0.8	6.2	6.9	6.5
Mulching with cotton stalk at 5 t ha ⁻¹	8.6	8.8	8.7	1.2	1.1	1.2	9.3	9.8	9.6
Mulching with paddy straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹	8.7	8.2	8.5	1.1	1.2	1.2	8.6	9.4	9.0
Cotton + Sunnhemp (1:1) and <i>in situ</i> mulching at 45 DAS	3.6	5.5	4.6	0.6	0.7	0.7	6.0	6.4	6.2
Cotton + Cowpea (1:1) and <i>in situ</i> mulching at 45 DAS	4.4	5.8	5.1	0.7	0.8	0.7	6.2	6.7	6.5
Weeding with cycle weeder at 25, 50 and 75 DAS	4.6	7.2	5.9	0.7	0.8	0.8	6.4	8.0	7.2
HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS	4.4	6.4	5.4	0.7	0.8	0.7	6.3	7.8	7.1
<i>Eucalyptus</i> extract @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	7.2	9.0	8.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	9.1	9.2	9.2
<i>Prosopis juliflora</i> extract @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	9.0	10.2	9.6	1.3	1.3	1.3	9.7	9.5	9.6
<i>Cassia tora</i> @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	8.8	10.0	9.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	9.4	9.6	9.5
<i>Parthenium</i> extract 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	8.9	10.4	9.7	1.3	1.3	1.3	9.5	9.7	9.6
Pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ as PE fb pyriithobac sodium 10 EC 75 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ + quizolofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ at 25 DAS as PoE.	3.6	4.7	4.2	0.6	0.7	0.6	5.3	6.5	5.9
Weed free check	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unweeded control	18.7	24.2	21.5	2.5	3.2	2.9	17.8	22.9	20.4
S.Em±	0.5	1.0	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	1.0	0.6
C.D. at 5%	1.3	2.9	1.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	1.2	2.8	1.6

Comment [H28]: Write treatment nos

Table 2. Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium uptake by cotton under high density planting ~~cotton as~~ as influenced by different non-chemical eco-friendly weed management practices

Treatment	N uptake(kg ha ⁻¹)			P uptake(kg ha ⁻¹)			K uptake(kg ha ⁻¹)		
	2017	2018	Pooled	2017	2018	Pooled	2017	2018	Pooled
Mulching with black polythene	87.0	90.5	88.8	10.6	10.4	10.5	79.0	79.7	79.4
Mulching with cotton stalk at 5 t ha ⁻¹	70.2	72.6	71.4	9.0	9.0	9.0	65.6	65.6	65.6
Mulching with paddy straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹	82.0	76.7	79.4	9.4	9.2	9.3	67.4	62.8	65.1
Cotton + Sunnhemp (1:1) and <i>in situ</i> mulching at 45 DAS	95.8	91.9	93.9	10.6	11.0	10.8	82.0	82.2	82.1
Cotton + Cowpea (1:1) and <i>in situ</i> mulching at 45 DAS	92.2	88.6	90.4	10.2	10.8	10.5	79.4	80.0	79.7
Weeding with cycle weeder at 25, 50 and 75 DAS	84.0	85.9	85.0	9.7	10.4	10.1	76.4	77.2	76.8
HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS	89.3	87.3	88.3	9.9	10.9	10.4	76.8	79.2	79.0
<i>Eucalyptus</i> extract @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	75.1	78.6	76.9	9.4	9.5	9.5	74.0	73.3	73.7
<i>Prosopis juliflora</i> extract @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	75.8	77.8	76.8	8.9	9.1	9.0	72.7	70.6	71.7
<i>Cassia tora</i> @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	75.6	75.5	75.6	9.0	9.2	9.1	72.0	72.0	72.0
<i>Parthenium</i> extract 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	75.3	75.6	75.5	8.7	9.2	9.0	72.5	71.2	71.9
Pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ as PE fb pyriproxyfen sodium 10 EC 75 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ + quizalofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ at 25 DAS as PoE.	91.6	96.6	94.1	10.8	11.9	11.4	85.2	84.6	84.9
Weed free check	106.2	105.7	106.0	13.2	12.8	13.0	96.8	93.7	95.3
Unweeded control	59.9	52.2	56.1	6.62	6.4	6.5	52.9	50.9	51.9
S.E.m±	3.1	3.9	2.2	0.4	0.6	0.3	3.6	3.0	2.2
C.D. at 5%	8.9	11.2	6.3	1.2	1.7	1.0	10.6	8.8	6.4

Comment [H29]: Write treatment nos

Table 3: Cotton Yield (Kh/ha) under HDPS as influenced by ~~in-eco~~eco-friendly weed management through non-chemical approaches in HDPS cotton

Treatment	2017	2018	Pooled
Mulching with black polythene	1293	1230	1262
Mulching with cotton stalk at 5 t ha ⁻¹	1072	1063	1068
Mulching with paddy straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹	1246	1174	1210
Cotton + Sunnhemp (1:1) and <i>in situ</i> mulching at 45 DAS	1340	1258	1299
Cotton + Cowpea (1:1) and <i>in situ</i> mulching at 45 DAS	1225	1182	1204
Weeding with cycle weeder at 25, 50 and 75 DAS	980	993	986
HW at 25 DAS and IC at 50 and 75 DAS	1069	1155	1112
<i>Eucalyptus</i> extract @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	1173	1257	1215
<i>Prosopis juliflora</i> extract @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	1121	1144	1133
<i>Cassia tora</i> @ 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	1148	1093	1120
<i>Parthenium</i> extract 20 % as PE fb IC at 50 and 75 DAS.	1145	1114	1130
Pendimethalin 38.7 CS @ 680 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ as PE fb pyriithobac sodium 10 EC 75 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ + quizolofop ethyl 5 EC @ 37.5 g a.i. ha ⁻¹ at 25 DAS as PoE.	1308	1239	1274
Weed free check	1467	1277	1372
Unweeded control	906	927	917
S.Em.±	55	62	47
CD at 5%	161	180	137

Comment [H30]: Write treatment nos