

Performance of post-emergence herbicide combinations on weed management and crop yield in direct seeded rice (*Oryza sativa* L.)

Abstract

Direct-seeded rice (DSR), an innovative alternative to traditional transplanting, has gained popularity for its cost-effectiveness and labour-saving attributes. Weeds pose a significant threat to DSR. In this study, the effectiveness of various weed management methods, including hand weeding and herbicide applications, was evaluated. Hand weeding proved most effective in controlling weeds, while specific herbicides, such as bispyribac sodium + pyrazosulfuron (T2) and triafamone + ethoxysulfuron (T6) applied at 16 days after sowing (DAS), demonstrated superior weed control efficiency, improved growth parameters, and enhanced yield. *Paspalum distichum* was effectively controlled by penoxsulam + cyhalofop-butyl (T7). The study emphasizes the importance of customizing weed control to local conditions, with the choice of suitable herbicides and practices aligning with prevalent weed biotypes in the specific farming system. Understanding the nuanced impacts of post-emergence herbicides is crucial in navigating the intricate landscape of weed management in direct-seeded rice.

Keywords: Hand weeding, bispyribac sodium + pyrazosulfuron, triafamone + ethoxysulfuron, weed control efficiency

Introduction:

In the dynamic realm of modern agriculture, rice is one of the most important crop for global food security as it is a staple food for more than 50% of the world population, providing more than 20% of the calorie intake [1]. The increase in population and an anticipated change in dietary preferences are expected to lead to a higher demand for rice in India. The rise in rice production must come from a higher yield because rice-growing acreage is decreasing. Consequently, the sustainability of rice ecosystems and the capacity to increase production in tandem with population development while reducing water and labour use is of paramount importance. DSR, an innovative alternative to traditional transplanting methods, has gained popularity for its cost-effectiveness and labour-saving attributes. As the demand for rice production intensifies to meet the ever-growing needs of a burgeoning population, the efficient management of weeds becomes paramount to ensure optimal crop yield. Unlike

conventional transplanting, where rice seedlings are grown in nurseries before being manually transplanted into flooded fields, DSR involves sowing seeds directly into prepared fields. This shift in cultivation methods brings forth a spectrum of advantages, ranging from resource conservation and labour efficiency to enhanced adaptability in diverse agroecosystems [2]. Furthermore, it enables the early establishment of wheat crops [3]. Weeds pose a serious threat to DSR crops [4], competing for essential resources such as sunlight, water, and nutrients. Higher weed infestation in DSR, particularly in its early stages, presents a considerable challenge. In some cases, weeds have been observed to cause a substantial 90% loss in yield for DSR. Therefore, weeds emerge as the foremost biological constraint affecting the production of DSR. This underscores the critical importance of effective weed management strategies to ensure the success and productivity of DSR cultivation [5,6,7]. Herbicidal weed management is recognized as the most efficient method in DSR [8] and combinations of them must be strategically mixed to kill the complex weed composition in DSR. In response to these challenges, post-emergence herbicides have become integral to modern weed management strategies, allowing for selective and timely intervention to suppress weed infestations while safeguarding the health and vigour of DSR plants. As we navigate the intricate landscape of weed management in DSR, understanding the nuanced impacts of post-emergence herbicides becomes imperative.

Material and methods

Field trials were conducted during the kharif season (2021-22) at Banaras Hindu University Agricultural Farm in Varanasi, India. The location experience semi-arid to semi-humid climate, with temperatures ranging from 28.5°C to 36°C and 1261.1 mm of total precipitation during the crop season. The soil texture is sandy clay loam soil, with a pH of 7.7 and 0.35% SOC. The experiment, replicated thrice in a Randomized Block Design, included nine weed management treatments with various herbicide dosages and combinations (Table. 1). Swarna (MTU 7029) rice was directly sown at a rate of 35 kg ha⁻¹ using a local furrow maker ("Kudali") with a 30 cm row spacing. Immediate irrigation followed to ensure uniform germination. Recommended nutrient doses (N:P:K-120:60:40 kg ha⁻¹) were applied using urea, diammonium phosphate and muriate of potash, and herbicides were sprayed 14 days after sowing using knapsack sprayer for post-emergence weed control. For rice plant biomass plants in a running metre of length is uprooted and oven dried. Whereas weed density, and biomass were assessed by randomly placing 50 cm x 50 cm quadrat at two places of each

plot. Grain yield was quantified at 14% moisture content. Statistical analysis was conducted using the appropriate Analysis of Variance method, as outlined by [9].

Table 1: Details of the treatments

S.N o.	Treatment	Rate (g or ml a.i. ha ⁻¹)	Surfactant
T ₁	Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	43.75 g	Spreadmax ^a @ 0.5 ml litre ⁻¹
T ₂	Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	52.50 g	Spreadmax ^a @ 0.5 ml litre ⁻¹
T ₃	Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	61.25 g	Spreadmax ^a @ 0.5 ml litre ⁻¹
T ₄	Bispyribac sodium 10% SC	25 ml	-
T ₅	Pyrazosulfuron 10% WP	15g	-
T ₆	Triafamone 20% + ethoxysulfuron 10% WG	66.5 g	-
T ₇	Penoxsulam 1.02% + cyhalofop-butyl 5.1% OD	135 ml	-
T ₈	Hand weeding (20 and 40 DAS)	-	-
T ₉	Untreated Control	-	-

Results and Discussion

We recorded 14 diverse weed flora in our experiment. Here data of 7 dominated weeds were being presented (Table: 2). Broadleaf weeds were the most dominated followed by grasses and sedges. Our findings are in line with earlier research by [10, 11,12]. Hand weeding was the best in controlling all types of weeds presented in our experiment. *Ceasuliaaxillaris* emerged as the most problematic weed in our experiment in terms of its growth and presence throughout the growing period. Among herbicidal treatment application of bispyribac sodium + pyrazosulfuron (T₂) and triafamone+ ethoxysulfuron (T₆) herbicides reduced the weed density of *Ceasuliaaxillaris*, *Physalis minima*, *Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Echinochloa colonum* and *Fimbristylis miliacea* more effectively as compared to other herbicidal treatments. Our study is in line with findings of [13,14,15,16]. Whereas *Paspalum distichum* was most effectively controlled by penoxsulam+ cyhalofop-butyl (T₇). Similar result was reported by [17]. All the herbicidal treatments were effective in controlling *Echinochloa colonum* and *Cyperus rotundus*. In terms of reducing total weed biomass and achieving higher weed control efficiency, bispyribac sodium + pyrazosulfuron (T₂) and

triflurothiol + ethoxysulfuron (T₆) emerged as the most effective herbicidal treatments (Figure:1). Herbicide applications significantly improved plant height and rice biomass by suppressing weed competition, enhancing resource utilization by rice plants (Table:3). Notably, the herbicide treatments bispyribac sodium + pyrazosulfuron (T₂) and triflurothiol + ethoxysulfuron displayed superior performance in promoting crop growth, suggesting their potential to boost rice yield. Pyrazosulfuron alone exhibited the least effectiveness against weeds. Results are consistent with previous findings highlighting the limitations of using a single herbicide [18]. Implementing hand weeding (20 and 40 DAS) and herbicide treatments effectively reduced weed competition, optimizing resources for rice growth and, consequently, enhancing crop characteristics. In the absence of weed control, shared resources led to decreased rice biomass and plant height, impacting photosynthate assimilation. Herbicide applications mitigated weed competition, creating a more favourable environment for rice growth and resulting in increased grain yield compared to the untreated control. While manual weeding demonstrated effectiveness at specific intervals, its scalability is hindered by technical constraints like labour availability [18]. Consequently, herbicide combinations, particularly bispyribac sodium + pyrazosulfuron (T₂) and triflurothiol + ethoxysulfuron (T₆), have emerged as practical alternatives based on yield due to their ease of use and effectiveness.




Figure: 1 Effect of post-emergence herbicide combinations on total dry weight and weed control efficiency (WCE) at 60 DAS in DSR

Table 2: Effects of post-emergence herbicide combinations on weed density in direct seeded rice

Treatment no	Rate (g or ml a.i. ha ⁻¹)	<i>C. axillaris</i>		<i>P. minima</i>		<i>P. hysterophorus</i>		<i>C. rotundus</i>		<i>E. colona</i>		<i>F. miliacea</i>		<i>P. distichum</i>	
		30 DAS	75 DAS	30 DAS	75 DAS	30 DAS	75 DAS	30 DAS	75 DAS	30 DAS	75 DAS	30 DAS	75 DAS	30 DAS	75 DAS
Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	43.75 g	2.7 ^d (7.3)	3.6 ^{ab} (13)	4.13 ^b (16.7)	2.4 (5.3)	4.1 ^{bc} (16.3)	2.7 (7)	4.3 ^a (18.7)	3.2 ^b (10)	2.7 ^{bcd} (7)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	3.01 ^{bcd} (9)	0.71 (0)	3.49 ^b (11.7)
Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	52.50 g	2.4 ^d (5.7)	3.17 ^b (9.7)	2.79 ^c (7.3)	2.1 (4.3)	3.3 ^{cd} (10.3)	2.6 (6.7)	4.10 ^a (16.3)	3.19 ^b (9.7)	2.48 ^{cd} (5.7)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	2.97 ^{cd} (8.3)	0.71 (0)	3.43 ^b (11.3)
Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	61.25 g	2.7 ^d (6.7)	3.5 ^b (12)	4.34 ^b (18.3)	2.4 (5.3)	4.3 ^b (17.7)	3.02 (8.7)	4.1 ^a (16.7)	3.2 ^b (10)	2.7 ^{bcd} (7)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	3.02 ^{bcd} (8.7)	0.71 (0)	3.5 ^b (12)
Bispyribac sodium 10% SC	25 ml	2.9 ^{cd} (8)	3.7 ^{ab} (14)	4.95 ^b (24)	2.5 (5.7)	4.1 ^b (16.3)	2.86 (7.7)	3.8 ^a (14.3)	3.39 ^b (11)	3.07 ^{bc} (9)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	3.67 ^{ab} (13)	0.71 (0)	3.1 ^{bc} (9.3)
Pyrazosulfuron 10% WP	15g	3.7 ^{bc} (13)	3.9 ^{ab} (15)	4.74 ^b (22)	2.3 (4.7)	3.5 ^{bcd} (12)	2.7 (6.7)	4.34 ^a (18.3)	3.34 ^b (10.7)	3.19 ^b (9.7)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	3.58 ^{bc} (12.3)	0.71 (0)	3.17 ^{bc} (9.7)
Triafamone 20% + ethoxysulfuron 10% WG	66.5 g	2.4 ^d (5.3)	3.1 ^b (9.3)	4.26 ^b (17.7)	2.3 (5)	3.2 ^d (10)	2.39 (5.3)	3.9 ^a (15)	3.1 ^b (9.3)	2.18 ^d (4.3)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	2.84 ^d (7.7)	0.71 (0)	3.4 ^b (11.3)
Penoxsulam 1.02% + cyhalofop-butyl 5.1% OD	135 ml	4.5 ^{ab} (19.7)	4.1 ^{ab} (16)	4.84 ^b (23)	2.4 (5.3)	3.58 ^{bcd} (12.3)	2.4 (5.3)	4.34 ^a (18.3)	3.39 ^b (11)	3.02 ^{bc} (8.7)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	3.5 ^{bc} (12)	0.71 (0)	2.8 ^{cd} (7.3)
Hand weeding (20 and 40 DAS)	-	1.3 ^c (1.3)	1.95 ^c (3.3)	2.04 ^d (3.7)	1.9 (3.3)	1.68 ^e (2.3)	1.95 (3.3)	2.3 ^b (5)	1.58 ^c (2)	1.68 ^c (2.3)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	2.7 ^d (7)	0.71 (0)	2.48 ^d (5.7)
Untreated Control	-	4.6 ^a (21.7)	4.6 ^a (20.7)	6.89 ^a (47.7)	2.9 (8.3)	6.5 ^a (42.3)	2.91 (8)	4.6 ^a (21)	4.1 ^a (16.3)	4.2 ^a (18)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	4.26 ^a (17.7)	0.71 (0)	4.18 ^a (17)

Data were subjected to square root ($\sqrt{x + 0.5}$) transformation; figures in parentheses are original values; Letters in common are not significantly different;

Table 3: Effects of weed management treatments on growth and yield

Treatments	Rate (g or ml a.i. ha ⁻¹)	Plant height (cm)		Dry weight (g) 35 DAS	Grain yield (Kg ha ⁻¹)	Straw yield (Kg ha ⁻¹)	Harvest index (H.I)
		45 DAS	100 DAS				
Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	43.75 g	40.4 ^b	76.5 ^b	20.3 ^{bc}	4200	9000	31.8
Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	52.50 g	41.8 ^a	81a ^b	22.2 ^{ab}	5038	11000	31.4
Bispyribac sodium 20% + pyrazosulfuron 15% WDG	61.25 g	40.8 ^{ab}	77.5 ^b	20.6 ^{bc}	4929	11270	30.4
Bispyribac sodium 10% SC	25 ml	39.8 ^{bc}	75.5 ^b	19.8 ^c	4078	9270	30.6
Pyrazosulfuron 10% WP	15g	40.3 ^b	79.5 ^{ab}	19.5 ^c	3505	7130	33.0
Triafamone 20% + ethoxysulfuron 10% WG	66.5 g	40.8 ^{ab}	80.25 ^{ab}	21.0 ^{bc}	4429	9970	30.8
Penoxsulam 1.02% + cyhalofop-butyl 5.1% OD	135 ml	40.4 ^b	77 ^b	20.1 ^{bc}	4258	9270	31.5
Hand weeding (20 and 40 DAS)	-	42.0 ^a	84.5 ^a	23.2 ^a	5130	11030	31.7
Untreated Control	-	39.0 ^c	65c	16.00 ^c	2233	5000	30.9

Letters in common are not significantly different

Conclusion

Weeds poses a threat to DSR cultivation, impacting yields and resource utilization. Hand weeding proved most effective in controlling weeds. Among the herbicides bispyribac sodium + pyrazosulfuron (T₂) and triafamone + ethoxysulfuron (T₆) applied at 16 days after sowing demonstrated superior weed control efficiency, better growth parameters and yield. Whereas *Paspalum distichum* was most effectively controlled by penoxsulam+ cyhalofop-butyl (T₇). Customizing weed control to suit local conditions is essential and the choice of suitable herbicides and practices should align with the prevalent weed biotypes in the specific farming system.

References

1. Fukagawa, N.K. and Ziska, L.H., 2019. Rice: Importance for global nutrition. *Journal of nutritional science and vitaminology*, 65(Supplement), pp.S2-S3.
2. Kachroo, D.; Bazaya, B. R. (2011). Efficacy of different herbicides on growth and yield of direct wet seeded rice sown through drum seeder. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*, 43 (1 & 2), 67-69
3. Balasubramanian, V., & Hill, J. E. (2002). Direct seeding of rice in Asia: emerging issues and strategic research needs for the 21st century. *Direct seeding: Research strategies and opportunities*, 3(5), 15-39.
4. Rao, A. N., Johnson, D. E., Sivaprasad, B., Ladha, J. K., & Mortimer, A. M. (2007). Weed management in direct seeded rice. *Advances in agronomy*, 93, 153-255.
5. Pandey, S.; Velasco, L.; Toriyama, K.; Heong, K.L.; Hardy, B. (2005). Trends in crop establishment methods in Asia and research issues. In *Rice is Life: Scientific Perspectives for the 21st Century*; International Rice Research Institute: Los Baños, Philippines, 178–181
6. Shekhawat, K.; Rathore, S. S.; Chauhan, B. S. Weed Management in Dry Direct-Seeded Rice: A Review on Challenges and Opportunities for Sustainable Rice Production. *Agronomy* 2022, 10, 1264, DOI: 10.3390/agronomy10091264
7. Chauhan, B. S., & Johnson, D. E. (2011). Row spacing and weed control timing affect yield of aerobic rice. *Field Crops Research*, 121(2), 226-231.
8. Marwat, K.B.; Khan, I.A.; Hassan, G. (2004). Efficacy of different pre and post-emergence for controlling weeds in chickpea. *Pakistan Journal of Weed Science Research*, 10, 51–54
9. Gomez, K.A. and Gomez, A.A., 1984. *Statistical procedures for agricultural research*. John Wiley & sons.
10. Mohapatra, S., Tripathy, S.K., & Mohanty, A.K. (2020). Herbicide combinations and nitrogen scheduling for weed management and yield improvement in transplanted rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*, 52(4), 313-317.
11. Khippal, A., Singh, J., & Chhokar, R. S. (2019). Control of complex weed flora in direct seeded rice using bispyribac sodium in combination with other herbicides. *Journal of Cereal Research*, 11(3), 282-285
12. Sanodiya, P., & Singh, M.K. (2017). Integrated weed management in direct-seeded rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*, 49(1), 10-14.
13. Hossain, A.; Malik, G. C. (2017). Herbicides combinations for control of complex weed flora in transplanted rice in Lateritic belt of West Bengal. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*, 49(3), 276-278
14. Kaur, S.; Bhullar, M. S.; Kaur, T. (2016). Management of mixed weed flora in transplanted rice using herbicide combinations. *Agricultural Research Journal*, 53(4), 483-487.
15. Menon, M. V.; Bridgit, T. K.; Girija, T. (2017). Efficacy of herbicide combinations for weed management in transplanted rice. *Journal of Tropical Agriculture*, 54(2), 204

16. Yadav, D. B.; Yadav, A.; Punia, S. S. (2019). Effectiveness of triafamone+ethoxysulfuron (pre-mix) against complex weed flora in transplanted rice and its residual effects on wheat. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*, 51(2),106-110
17. Jacob, G.; Menon, M. V.; Abraham, C. T. (2017). Herbicidal management of Chinese sprangletop (*Leptochloa chinensis*) in direct-seeded rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*, 49(2): 176–178
18. Khaliq, A.; Matloob, A. (2011). Weed crop competition period in three fine rice cultivars under DSR culture. *Pakistan Weed Science Research*, 17, 229–243

Comment [U1]: 1. Does the use of herbicides have no impact on the environment in the future?
2. It is best to explain the advantages of this method so that it can be implemented by farmers, especially for social and economic purposes that support health.
3. What is the economic and environmental value of this method?
4. Use of literature should be at least 5 years if it is in the form of research results.