Original Research Article

Effect of Nutrient Levels and Weed Management on Weed Control Efficiency, Grain Yield and Economics of Mustard

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted in *rabi* season 2018-19 and 2019-20 at Research farm of Bihar Agricultural College, Sabour with the aim to find out the effect of nutrient and weed management on grain yield, WCE and economics of mustard. This experiment consisted of three nutrient levels (N_1-soil test-based, N_2-100 % RDF, N_3-125 % RDF) in main plot while eight weed management practices (W_1-Weedy, W_2-HW, W_3-pendimethalin, W_4-pendimethalin *fb* quizalofop, W_5-pendimethalin *fb* clodinafop, W_6-oxyflourfen, W_7-oxyflourfen *fb* quizalofop, W_8-oxyflourfen *fb* clodinafop) in sub plots, laid out in split plot design replicated thrice. Results indicated that pendimethalin 30 EC 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE *fb* quizalofop 5 EC 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE + 125% RDF (N_3W_4) exhibited highest WCE (85.66 and 88.83 %) in 2018-19 and 2019-20, respectively being at par with N_3W_5 (81.84 %) in 2018-19 only. Though HW at 25 and 50 DAS + 125% RDF (N_3W_2) recorded highest WCE (100 %) than weedy. Grain yield was maximum (18.63 and 17.78 q ha^{-1}) under N_3W_4 being at par with N_3W_7 in 2018-19; while in 2019-20, it was at par with rest of the treatments except N_3W_1 and N_3W_6. In 2018-19, N_3W_4 noted highest net return (Rs. 59068 ha^{-1}) being at par with N_3W_2 and N_3W_7. While in 2019-20, same treatment exhibited highest net return (Rs. 58279 ha^{-1}) being at par with rest of the treatments except N_3W_6 and N_3W_1. In 2018-19, N_3W_4 recorded highest B: C ratio (2.78) being at par with rest of the treatments except N_3W_2 and N_3W_1. In 2019-20, N_3W_7 exhibited highest B: C ratio (2.80) being at par with rest of the treatments except N_3W_6 and N_3W_1.

Key words: Economics, Mustard, Nutrient levels, Weed management, Yield

INTRODUCTION

Oilseeds occupy 27.5 M ha which account for 14% of total cropped area in the country with production 24.7 M tonnes, accounts for nearly 5% of gross national product. Mustard rank third in area and production after groundnut and soybean. It is mainly used for its oil for human consumption. Mustard is potential crop in *rabi* season due to its wider adaptability and suitability to exploit residual moisture in North part of India (Mukherjee, 2010). Per hectare productivity of mustard in country is quite low (11.5 q ha^{-1}) (Piri and Sharma 2006). To increase the productivity, some constraints of low productivity like nutrient and weed management may be taken under consideration.

Yield depression in mustard due to weed infestation varied from 20-70% depending on the density of weed flora and time of their occurrence (O-Donovan *et al*., 2007). In the past, farmers were bound to follow traditional weed control *viz*., hand-pulling, hand- or mechanical hoeing. These practices apart from labour, energy intensive, weather dependent, are very difficult to apply due to scarcity and high wages of labour. In the past, a few emphasis has been given to improve mustard productivity through weed management. Competition by weeds at initial stage is a major limiting factor for its low productivity. Manual weeding at 3-4 weeks after sowing is the most common practice to control weeds in mustard. But increasing wages and unavailability of labour, they compel for alternative option over manual weeding; which seems as herbicidal weed control. Pre-

emergence herbicides are used in mustard to control weeds, however, not all weeds are controlled effectively by these herbicides and left over weeds create more serious problem during active growth period. So there is a possibility to explore the use of post emergence herbicides in mustard.

Application of adequate fertilizer to plant crop increased their leaf growth, which facilitates earlier shading of the soil surface and thus reduces weed seed germination (Wicks *et al*., 2012). Mustard responds well to N and P fertilizer depending upon initial soil fertility status and moisture availability. Soil test based fertilizer can be effective tool in boosting yield of mustard (Kumawat *et al*., 2014). Keeping these in view, an experiment on effect of nutrient and weed management strategies on weed control efficiency and profitable productivity of mustard was conducted.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was carried out in *rabi* season of 2018-19 and 2019-20 at Research Farm of Bihar Agricultural College, Sabour, Bhagalpur situated at latitude 25°15' 40" N and longitude 87°2' 42" E with an altitude of 37.46 meters above mean sea level with the aim to assess the impact of nutrient levels and weed management on grain yield, WCE and economics of mustard. The soil of experiment was sandy loam, pH 7.2, organic carbon 0.48 %, available N 123.47 kg ha^{-1}, available P 26.19 kg ha^{-1} and K 168.51 kg ha^{-1}. The experiment was laid out in split plot design with three nutrient levels *viz*., N_1-soil test-based RDF (100:40:40:20:6.25 kg ha^{-1} N P K S Zn), N_2-100 % RDF (80:40:40:20:5 kg ha^{-1} N P K S Zn), N_3-125 % RDF (100:50:50:25:6.25 kg ha^{-1} N P K S Zn) in main plot and eight weed management practices *viz*. W_1-Weedy, W_2-HW at 25 & 50 DAS, W_3-pendimethalin, W_4-pendimethalin *fb* quizalofop, W_5-pendimethalin *fb* clodinafop, W_6-oxyflourfen, W_7-oxyflourfen *fb* quizalofop, W_8-oxyflourfen *fb* clodinafop in subplots, replicated thrice.

To carry out the experiment, land preparation operations *viz*., pre sowing irrigation, ploughing and levelling were done. Mustard variety, Pusa bold was sown with seed rate 5 kg ha^{-1} on 22th November, 2018 and on 20th November, 2019 and harvested on 11th March, 2019 and 08th March, 2020 in Ist and IInd year, respectively. The dose of nitrogen, phosphorus, potash, zinc and sulphur was applied *viz*., soil test based, 100 and 125 % RDF in furrows as basal and N was top dressed into splits. Other weed management practices i.e. hand weeding at 25 and 50 DAS, pre emergence alone and/ or with post emergence herbicide spray was practiced as per treatment in the experimental plots.

Grain yield was measured from net plot area. Net return of the treatments was calculated by subtracting cost of cultivation from gross return. B: C ratio was calculated by dividing net return with cost of cultivation. WCE of the treatments was calculated as per standard formula. The data were analysed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique (Gomez and Gomez, 1984).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Weed control efficiency

The data depicted in Table 1 & Table 2 on weed control efficiency of mustard under the influence of nutrient levels and weed management practices revealed that among herbicides, application of pendimethalin 30 EC @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE *fb* quizalofop 5 EC @ 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE along with 125% RDF (N_3W_4) exhibited significantly highest weed control efficiency (85.66 and 88.83 %) during 2018-19 and 2019-20, respectively which was found statistically at par with pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE *fb* clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE along with 125% RDF (N_3W_5) (81.84 %) in 2018-19 only. Though hand weeding at 25 and 50 DAS along with 125% RDF (N_3W_2) recorded significantly highest weed control efficiency (100 %) as compared to weedy along with 125% RDF (N_3W_1) which recorded zero value during both the years.

Application of herbicide alone or in combination with other herbicides and two hand weeding exhibited maximum WCE due to their lowest weed dry weight and weed population that might the fact that they would influence directly on weed germination and also controls late flushes of weeds

due to its long persistency resulting to be more effective against weeds. These results are in conformity by Singh *et al*. (2000) and Chaudhary *et al*. (2011). Amongst fertility levels, maximum WCE was recorded with 125 % RDF due to lower weed density that might be due to better growth of crop over weeds and smothering effect of crop vegetative growth over the weeds leading to suppression of weeds population greatly. Effective control of broad-leaved weeds due to combined activity of pre- and post-emergence herbicides has also been reported by Sharma *et al*. (2007).

Table 1: Effect of different treatments on weed control efficiency (%) of mustard during 2018-19

Weed management / Nutrient Levels	W_1-Weedy	W_2-Two HW at 25 & 50 DAS	W_3-Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1}	W_4-Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_5- Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_6-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1}	W_7-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_8-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Clodinafop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	MEAN
N_1-Soil test 100:40:40:20:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	0.00	10 0.0	52.54	82.58	78.40	54.14	74.40	69.13	**63. 90**
N_2-100% RDF 80:40:40:20:5 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	0.00	10 0.0	48.90	78.49	73.47	48.39	71.35	66.73	**60. 92**
N_3-125% RDF 100:50:50:25:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	0.00	10 0.0	56.00	85.66	81.84	60.04	78.10	74.45	**67. 01**
MEAN	**0.00**	**100.0**	**52.48**	**82.24**	**77.90**	**54.19**	**74.62**	**70.10**	
	SEm (±) = 0.59			SEm (±) = 0.86		SEm (±) = 1.49		SEm (±) = 1.51	
	CD (N) at 5% = 2.30			CD (W) at 5% = 2.45		CD (WxN) at 5% = 4.25		CD (NxW) = 4.56	

Table 2: Effect of different treatments on weed control efficiency (%) of mustard during 2019-20

Weed management / Nutrient Levels	W_1-Weedy	W_2-Two HW at 25 & 50 DAS	W_3-Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1}	W_4-Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_5- Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_6-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1}	W_7-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_8-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Clodinafop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	MEAN
N_1-Soil test 100:40:40:20:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	0.00	10 0.0	63.89	85.82	80.80	55.61	76.35	74.93	**67. 17**
N_2-100% RDF 80:40:40:20:5 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	0.00	10 0.0	56.80	78.04	73.22	48.69	70.03	66.03	**61. 60**
N_3-125% RDF 100:50:50:25:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	0.00	10 0.0	69.81	88.83	84.39	59.46	81.32	77.21	**70. 13**
MEAN	**0.00**	**100.0**	**63.50**	**84.23**	**79.47**	**54.58**	**75.90**	**72.72**	
	SEm (±) = 0.34			SEm (±) = 0.74		SEm (±) = 1.27		SEm (±) = 1.24	
	CD (N) at 5% = 1.33			CD (W) at 5% = 2.10		CD (WxN) at 5% = 3.82		CD (NxW) = 3.72	

Grain yield

The data (Table 3 & Table 4) on grain yield of mustard under the influence of nutrient levels and weed management practices revealed that among herbicides, grain yield of mustard was observed significantly maximum (18.63 and 17.78 q ha^{-1}) during 2018-19 and 2019-20, respectively under pendimethalin 30 EC @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE *fb* quizalofop 5 EC @ 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE along with 125% RDF (N_3W_4) which was found at par with N_3W_7 in 2018-19; while in 2019-20, it was at par with rest of the treatments except weedy along with 125% RDF (N_3W_1) and oxyflourfen 23.5 EC @ 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} along with 125% RDF **(**N_3W_6). Though hand weeding at 25 and 50 DAS along with 125% RDF (N_3W_2) recorded significantly highest grain yield (19.44 q ha^{-1}) which was at par with N_3W_4 in 2018-19 only. However, in 2019-20, hand weeding at 25 and 50 DAS along with 125% RDF (N_3W_2) recorded significantly highest grain yield (19.94 q ha^{-1}) of mustard over rest of the treatments.

Higher grain yield owing to 125% RDF was because of better growth and more photosynthate translocation from source to sink (Tripathi *et al*. 2010, Rana *et al*. 2005). Greater grain yield at high fertility was attributed to increased growth (Kumar, 2006). This might be due to efficient weed control. This was in conformity with the finding of O'-Donovan *et al*. (2007). Due to adequate nutrient supply under increase in nutrient doses which resulted in higher seed yield. These findings were reported by Roul *et al*. (2006) and Kumar and Yadav (2007). Dubey *et al*. (2013).

Grain yield varied in herbicide treatment was due to the fact that crop has least competition for nutrient, moisture and space, provides opportunity for proper growth than weedy. Similar results were reported by Nagar *et al*. (2009). Hand weeding at 25 and 50 DAS conceded with critical growth stages resulted in higher yield. Similar finding were reported by Chauhan *et al*. (2005). These treatments kept the crop almost weed free upto 40-50 DAS as a consequence of which reduction in weed dry matter and less competition thus saved a substantial amount of nutrients for crop that led to profuse growth enabling the crop to utilize more soil moisture and nutrients from deeper soil layers.

Table 3: Effect of different treatments on grain yield (q ha^{-1}) of mustard during 2018-19

Weed management / Nutrient Levels	**W_1-Weedy**	**W_2-Two HW at 25 & 50 DAS**	**W_3-Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1}**	**W_4-Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE**	**W_5- Pendimethalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE**	**W_6-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1}**	**W_7-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE**	**W_8-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Clodinafop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE**	**MEAN**
N_1-Soil test 100:40:40:20:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	8.94	17.64	14.12	15.86	15.53	14.95	15.39	15.25	**14.71**
N_2-100% RDF 80:40:40:20:5 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	10.12	15.31	13.16	14.93	14.37	10.80	14.29	14.24	**13.40**
N_3-125% RDF 100:50:50:25:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	9.07	19.44	14.94	18.63	16.34	15.74	16.78	16.05	**15.87**
MEAN	**9.38**	**17.46**	**14.08**	**16.47**	**15.42**	**13.83**	**15.49**	**15.18**	
	SEm (±) = 0.37			SEm (±) = 0.38		SEm (±) = 0.66		SEm (±) = 0.72	
	CD (N) at 5% =1.44			CD (W) at 5% =1.09		CD (WxN) at 5% =1.89		CD (NxW) = 2.25	

Two hand weeding at 25 and 50 DAS produced maximum grain yield as they provide long time weed control. These favourable effects in rhizosphere were more conspicuous in HW as this

improved soil tilth by making it loose and porous, vulnerable for crop to utilize water and air. Under weedy condition, although vegetative growth reached up to a level but the sink was not sufficient enough to accumulate meaningful photosynthate translocation towards seed formation. Similar results were also reported by Degra *et al*. (2011) and Yadav *et al*. (2014).

Table 4: Effect of different treatments on grain yield (q ha^{-1}) of mustard during 2019-20

Weed management / Nutrient Levels	W_1-Weedy	W_2-Two HW at 25 & 50 DAS	W_3-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1}	W_4-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_5- Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_6-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1}	W_7-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_8-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Clodinafop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	MEAN
N_1-Soil test 100:40:40:20:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	8.94	17.64	14.12	15.39	15.53	14.95	15.59	14.92	**14.64**
N_2-100% RDF 80:40:40:20:5 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	7.12	16.17	13.36	14.99	14.74	14.17	14.80	13.44	**13.60**
N_3-125% RDF 100:50:50:25:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	9.41	19.94	15.94	17.78	16.34	13.08	16.63	17.25	**15.80**
MEAN	**8.49**	**17.92**	**14.48**	**16.05**	**15.54**	**14.07**	**15.67**	**15.20**	
	SEm (±) = 0.26			SEm (±) = 0.37		SEm (±) = 0.63		SEm (±) = 0.65	
	CD (N) at 5% = 1.02			CD (W) at 5% = 1.04		CD (WxN) at 5% = 2.00		CD (NxW) =2.04	

Table 5: Effect of different treatments on net return (Rs. ha^{-1}) of mustard during 2018-19

Weed management / Nutrient Levels	W_1-Weedy	W_2-Two HW at 25 & 50 DAS	W_3-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1}	W_4-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_5- Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_6-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1}	W_7-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_8-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Clodinafop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	MEAN
N_1-Soil test 100:40:40:20:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	21868	51865	42937	48322	48317	46979	46900	47851	**44380**
N_2-100% RDF 80:40:40:20:5 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	27283	42385	39300	44851	43992	30122	42748	44075	**39344**
N_3-125% RDF 100:50:50:25:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	21583	58598	45503	59068	50914	49509	52042	50402	**48452**
MEAN	**23578**	**50949**	**42580**	**50747**	**47741**	**42203**	**47230**	**47443**	
	SEm (±) = 1570			SEm (±) = 1637		SEm (±) = 2835		SEm (±) = 3082	
	CD (N) at 5% = 6165			CD (W) at 5% = 4671		CD (WxN) at 5% = 8091		CD (NxW) = 9653	

The lowest yield was recorded in weedy that might be due to severe competition by weeds, which made the crop incompetent to take up more moisture and nutrients, consequently growth was adversely affected. Similar results were also reported by Sharma and Jain (2002) and Yadav (2004.).

Net return

The data presented in Table 5 & Table 6 on net return of mustard under the influence of nutrient levels and weed management practices revealed that among herbicides, in 2018-19, application of pendimethalin 30 EC @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE *fb* quizalofop 5 EC @ 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE along with 125% RDF (N_3W_4) recorded significantly highest net return (Rs. 59068 ha^{-1}) of mustard which was statistically at par with hand weeding at 25 and 50 DAS along with 125% RDF (N_3W_2) and oxyflourfen 23.5 EC @ 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} *fb* quizalofop 5 EC 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE along with 125% RDF (N_3W_7). While in 2019-20, same treatment exhibited significantly highest net return (Rs. 58279 ha^{-1}) of mustard which was at par with rest of the treatments except oxyflourfen 23.5 EC @ 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} along with 125% RDF (N_3W_6) and weedy along with 125% RDF (N_3W_1).

Highest net return with 125% RDF was obviously due to higher grain yield because of low herbicide cost. These results corroborate with Nagar *et al*. (2009) and Chaudhary *et al*. (2011). Roul *et al*. (2006) reported higher monitory advantage in 125% RDF. Net return due to hand weeding was lower than herbicide dose.

Table 6: Effect of different treatments on net return (Rs. ha^{-1}) of mustard during 2019-20

Weed management / Nutrient Levels	W_1-Weedy	W_2-Two HW at 25 & 50 DAS	W_3-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1}	W_4-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_5- Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_6-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1}	W_7-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_8-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Clodinafop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	MEAN
N_1-Soil test 100:40:40:20:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	22698	54528	44846	48486	50429	49113	49868	48296	**46033**
N_2-100% RDF 80:40:40:20:5 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	14992	48296	41889	47167	47477	46241	46864	42150	**41885**
N_3-125% RDF 100:50:50:25:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	23822	64020	52093	58279	53152	39638	53701	57865	**50321**
MEAN	**20504**	**55615**	**46276**	**51311**	**50353**	**44997**	**50144**	**49437**	
	SEm (±) = 1185			SEm (±) = 1663		SEm (±) = 2881		SEm (±) = 2944	
	CD (N) at 5% = 4651			CD (W) at 5% = 4747		CD (WxN) at 5% = 9082		CD (NxW) = 9280	

B: C ratio

The data (Table 7 & Table 8) on B: C ratio of mustard under the influence of nutrient levels and weed management practices revealed that among herbicides, in 2018-19, application of pendimethalin 30 EC @ 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE *fb* quizalofop 5 EC @ 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE + 125% RDF (N_3W_4) recorded significantly highest B: C ratio (2.78) of mustard which was statistically at par with rest of the treatments except hand weeding at 25 and 50 DAS along with 125% RDF (N_3W_2) and weedy along with 125% RDF (N_3W_1). While in 2019-20, oxyflourfen 23.5 EC @ 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} PE *fb*

clodinafop 15 WP @ 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE along with 125% RDF (N_3W_7) exhibited significantly highest B: C ratio (2.80) which was found at par with rest of the treatments except N_3W_6 and N_3W_1.

Maximum B: C ratio might be due to lower labour charges as compared to two hand weeding. which in turn gave minimum B: C ratio. These results are in conformity with the result of Yadav *et al*. (2014). Hand weeding was costly; therefore, all herbicidal treatments were superior to it.

Table 7: Effect of different treatments on B:C ratio of mustard during 2018-19

Weed management / Nutrient Levels	W_1-Weedy	W_2-Two HW at 25 & 50 DAS	W_3-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1}	W_4-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_5- Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_6-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1}	W_7-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_8-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Clodinafop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	MEAN
N_1-Soil test 100:40:40:20:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	1.30	2.12	2.36	2.38	2.56	2.68	2.38	2.62	**2.30**
N_2-100% RDF 80:40:40:20:5 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	1.68	1.77	2.24	2.27	2.41	1.77	2.23	2.49	**2.11**
N_3-125% RDF 100:50:50:25:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	1.22	2.30	2.38	2.78	2.58	2.68	2.52	2.63	**2.39**
MEAN	**1.40**	**2.06**	**2.33**	**2.48**	**2.52**	**2.38**	**2.38**	**2.58**	
	SEm (±) = 0.09			SEm (±) = 0.09		SEm (±) = 0.15		SEm (±) = 0.17	
	CD (N) at 5% = NS			CD (W) at 5% = 0.25		CD (WxN) at 5% = 0.44		CD (NxW) = 0.52	

Table 8: Effect of different treatments on B:C ratio of mustard during 2019-20

Weed management / Nutrient Levels	W_1-Weedy	W_2-Two HW at 25 & 50 DAS	W_3-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1}	W_4-Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_5- Pendi methalin 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE + Clodinafop 60 a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_6-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1}	W_7-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Quizalofop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	W_8-Oxyflourfen 150 g a.i. ha^{-1} + Clodinafop 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE	MEAN
N_1-Soil test 100:40:40:20:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	1.26	2.11	2.31	2.24	2.49	2.60	2.36	2.45	**2.23**
N_2-100% RDF 80:40:40:20:5 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	0.86	1.91	2.22	2.24	2.42	2.52	2.28	2.20	**2.08**
N_3-125% RDF 100:50:50:25:6.25 kg NPKSZn ha^{-1}	1.26	2.39	2.55	2.58	2.51	1.99	2.43	2.80	**2.31**
MEAN	**1.13**	**2.14**	**2.36**	**2.36**	**2.47**	**2.37**	**2.36**	**2.48**	

	SEm (±) = 0.06	SEm (±) = 0.08	SEm (±) = 0.14	SEm (±) = 0.15
	CD (N) at 5% = NS	CD (W) at 5% = 0.23	CD (WxN) at 5% = 0.45	CD (NxW) = 0.47

CONCLUSION

Thus it might be concluded that application of pendimethalin 30 EC 1.0 kg a.i. ha^{-1} PE *fb* quizalofop 5 EC 60 g a.i. ha^{-1} PoE along with 125% RDF (100:50:50:25:6.25 kg ha^{-1} N P K S Zn) exhibited significantly highest grain yield, net return and B:C ratio of mustard besides improvement in weed control efficiency of the applied herbicides.

REFERENCES

- Kumar N. Integrated nutrient management practices in mustard (Brassica juncea L.) and its effect on the productivity of succeeding rice crop. 2006; Ph.D. Chaudhary Charan Singh, Univerisity, Meerut.
- Mukherjee D. Productivity, profitability and apparent nutrient balance under different crop sequence in mid-hill condition. Ind. J. of Agril. Sci. 2010; 80(5):420- 22.
- O'-Donovan JT, Blackshaw RE, Harker KN, Clayton GW, Moyer JR, Dosdall LM, Maurice DC, Turkington TK. Integrated approaches to managing weeds in spring-sown crops in western Canada. Crop Protec. 2007; 26:390-398.
- Piri I, Sharma SN. Effect of levels and sources of sulphur on yield attributes, yield and quality of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). Ind. J. of Agron. 2006; 51(3):217-220.
- Rana KS, Rana DS, Gautam RC. Influence of phosphorus, sulphur and boron on growth, yield and nutrient uptake and economics of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under rainfed condition. Ind. J. of Agron. 2005; 50(4):314-316.
- Wicks GA, Burnside OC, Felton WL. Mechanical weed management, In: Hand Book of Weed Management Systems. (Ed. Smith AE), Marcel Dekkers, Inc., New York, USA; 2012..
- Chaudhary SU, Hussain M, Iqbal J. Effect of different herbicides on weed control and yield of canola (*Brassica napus*). J. of Agril. Res. 2011; 49(4):483-490.
- Kumawat A, Pareek BL, Yadav RS, Rathore PS. Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth, yield, quality and nutrient uptake of Indian mustard (Brassica juncea) in arid zone of Rajasthan. Ind. J. of Agron. 2014; 59(1):119-123.
- Chauhan YS, Bhargava MK, Jain VK. Weed management in Indian mustard. Ind. J. of Agron. 2005; 50:149–151.
- Sharma R, Rana MC, Angiras NN, Chopra P. Efficacy of clodinafop and row spacing in controlling weeds in gobhi sarson (*Brassica napus* var. oleracea). Ind. J. of Weed Sci. 2007; 39:219–222.
- Singh SK, Jain NK, Poonia BL. Integrated weed management in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*). Ind. J. of Agril. Sci. 2000; 70:850–852.
- Kumar, Harendra, Yadav, DS. Effect of phosphorus and sulphur levels on growth, yield and quality of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*) cultivars. Ind. J. Agron. 2007; 52(2):154-157.
- Roul PK, Sarawgl SK, Shrivastava GK, Kumar, D. Effect of integrated nutrient management techniques on productivity, nitrogen uptake, nitrogen use efficiency, economics and energetics of rice (*Oryza sativa*)-Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*) sequence. Ind. J. Agron. 2006; 51(3):170-173.
- Nagar RK, Meena BS, Dadheech RC. Effect of integrated weed and nutrient management on weed density, productivity and economics of coriander (*Coriandrum sativum*). Ind. J. of Weed Sci. 2009; 41(1&2):71-75.
- Sharma OL, Jain NK. Effect of herbicides on weed dynamics and seed yield of Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea*). Ind. J. of Agril. Sci. 2002; 72(6):322-324.

- Yadav RP. Effect of herbicides alone and in combination with cultural methods on weed control in Indian mustard (*Brassica napus*). Ind. J. Agron. 2004; 49(4):268-270.
- Degra, ML, Pareek BL, Shivran RK, Jat, RD. Integrated weed management in Indian mustard and its residual effect on succeeding pearl millet. Ind. J. of Weed Sci. 2011; 43(1&2):73-76.
- Yadav JP, Banga RS, Yadav A, Bajiya R. Integrated weed management in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.). Ind. J. of Agril. Sci. 2014; 70(3):493-500.
- Dubey SK, Tripathi SK, Singh B. Effect of sulphur and zinc level on growth, yield and quality of mustard. Research & Reviews: A Journal of Crop Sci. and Tech. 2013; 2(1):1-11.
- Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical procedures for agricultural research (2 ed.). John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1984; 680.
- Tripathi MK, Chaturvedi S, Shukla DK and Mahapatra BS. Yield performance and quality in Indian mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) as affected by integrated nutrient management. Ind. J. of Agron. 2010; 55(2):138-142.