INTEGRATED WEED MANAGEMENT IN IRRIGATED HYBRID COTTON

I. Gnanavel and S. Babu

Department of Agronomy, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar - 608 002, India.

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted during January-July, 2005 to study the effect of integrated weed control methods in irrigated cotton hybrid. Pre-emergence application of fluchloralin at 1.00 kg ha⁻¹ followed by post-emergence directed application of glyphosate at 0.80 kg ha⁻¹ at 45 DAS recorded the least weed count (19.39 m²) and weed dry matter production (124.70 kg ha⁻¹) favouring higher seed cotton yield (25.34 q ha-1). Application of fluchloralin and pendimethalin at lower doses in combination with one hand weeding produced significantly higher seed cotton yields than application of these herbicides alone in higher doses.

important commercial crop of India and plays a pivotal role in agricultural economy of the country. Cotton, being a long duration, wide spaced and relatively slow growing crop in early stages, is subjected to a severe weed menace. Weed infestation in cotton has been reported to offer severe competition and causing yield reduction to the extent of 74 per cent (Shelke and Bhosle, 1990). Inadequate weed control is considered as a major constraint for high yield. Manual weeding is not always practicable, being expensive and time consuming. Availability of labour for timely weeding may be inadequate owing to peak season of labour demand. Preemergence application of herbicides would be appropriate for minimizing only the early weed competition and problem of late emerging weeds is more serious. Further, the performance of soil applied herbicides has been found to be erratic due to lack of soil moisture and high temperature at sowing. So, pre-emergence herbicides need to be integrated with hand weeding or followed by post-emergence herbicides. Based on the above facts in view, the present investigation was carried out to evolve a suitable effective weed control methods for irrigated cotton hybrid.

A field experiment was conducted at Department of Agronomy, Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu, India, during January-July, 2005 to study the integrated weed control programs

Cotton (Cossypium hirsutum L.) is a very in irrigated cotton hybrid. The experimental station is located at 11° 24' latitude, 79° 41' longitude at an altitude of 5.79 m above mean sea level. The soil of the experimental field was clayey loam with a pH of 7.7 and was low in available nitrogen (210 kg ha-1), medium in available phosphorus (19.2 kg ha-1) and high in available potassium (301 kg ha-1). A set of nine treatments (Table 1) was laid out in randomized block design with three replications. The sowing of cotton seeds of hybrid RCH 2 was done on 20^{th} January, 2005 at spacing of 120 x 60 cm. The recommended doses of 120 kg N, 60 kg P₀O₂ and 60 kg K₂O ha⁻¹ were applied along with farm yard manure (FYM) at 12.5 t ha-1. The whole quantity of PO, KO and FYM and half dose of nitrogen were applied at the time of field preparation. Remaining half dose of nitrogen was applied at 60 days after sowing (DAS). The pre-emergence herbicide pendimethalin was sprayed on 3 days after sowing (DAS) by knap sack sprayer with flood jet nozzle using 600 l of water ha⁻¹ as per the treatments. Fluchloralin was sprayed on dry soil and was immediately followed by irrigation. Glyphosate was sprayed at 45 DAS as per treatments. The directed application of this herbicide was done using a protective hood to save the crop. All the intercultural operations were done as and when required. The data on weed count and weed dry matter production (DMP) were recorded at

Table 1. Effect of treatments on individual weed species count in cotton on 90 DAS

Treatments Cyperus Cynodon Trianthema Echinochloa Panicum Eclipta Cleome Othe											
Treatments	Treatments Cyperus rotundus		Trianthema	Echinochloa	Panicum	Eclipta	Cleome	Others			
	rotunaus	dactylon	portulacastrum	colonum	repens	alba	viscosa				
Control	6.76	2.37	4.60	5.08	4.37	3.42	4.64	3.11			
	(45.20)	(5.10)	(20.60)	(25.33)	(18.61)	(11.10)	(21.06)	(9.20)			
Hand weeding	3.15	-	2.04	1.68	1.58	1.47	1.23	1.87			
(HW) Twice	(9.40)		(3.66)	(2.33)	(1.00)	(1.66)	(1.00)	(3.00)			
at 30 &											
60 DAS											
Glyphosate @	2.21	-	3.03	2.42	2.20	2.04	1.58	2.98			
1.10 kg ha ⁻¹	(4.40)		(8.66)	(5.33)	(4.33)	(3.66)	(2.00)	(8.40)			
Pendimethalin	2.80	2.17	3.29	3.54	1.98	1.96	2.27	2.92			
@ 1.50 kg ha ⁻¹	(7.33)	(4.20)	(10.33)	(12.00)	(8.40)	(3.33)	(4.66)	(8.00)			
Pendimethalin	3.11	1.58	2.48	-	-	2.20	1.96	1.58			
@ 1.00 kg ha ⁻¹	(9.20)	(2.00)	(5.66)			(4.33)	(3.33)	(2.00)			
+ HW at											
45 DAS											
Pendimethalin	2.17	1.58	2.55	1.23	1.78	1.22	1.58	1.87			
@ 1.00 kg ha ⁻¹	(4.20)	(2.00)	(6.00)	(2.14)	(2.66)	(1.00)	(2.00)	(3.00)			
+ Glyphosate											
@ 0.80 kg ha ⁻¹											
Fluchloralin@	2.93	1.78	3.58	2.92	2.35	2.12	2.17	2.92			
1.50 kg ha ⁻¹	(8.10)	(2.66)	(12.33)	(8.00)	(5.00)	(4.00)	(4.20)	(8.00)			
Fluchloralin	2.42	1.61	2.81	1.58	1.58	-	-	2.35			
@ 1.00 kg ha ⁻¹	(5.33)	(2.10)	(7.40)	(2.00)	(2.00)			(5.00)			
+ HW at											
45 DAS											
Fluchloralin	2.04	-	2.39	1.96	1.87	1.30	-	1.87			
@ 1.00 kg ha ⁻¹	(3.66)		(5.20)	(3.33)	(3.00)	(1.20)		(3.00)			
+ Glyphosate											
@ 0.80 kg ha ⁻¹											
$SE_{_{D}}$	0.76	0.65	0.86	-	-	-	-	0.72			
CD (p=0.05)	0.38	0.32	0.43	-	-	-	-	0.36			

Figures in parentheses are original values before square root transformation

90 DAS and weed control index (WCI) of different treatments was computed using data on weed DMP. Final picking was completed on 12th July, 2005. The observation recorded on cotton were plant height, number of sympodial branches plant⁻¹, number of bolls plant⁻¹ and seed cotton yield ha⁻¹. The experimental data were statistically analyzed using the methods described by Panse and Sukhatme (1978). After subjecting the data to analysis of variance, least significant difference was worked out at 5 per cent probability level. The data on weed count were the weed count (19.39 m⁻²) and weed DMP

transformed by square root transformation, before analysis.

Effect on weeds: The predominant weeds of the experimental plot were: Cyperus rotundus, Cynodon dactylon, Trianthema portulacastrum, Echinochloa colonum, Eclipta alba, Panicum repens and Cleane viscosa. All the weed control treatments caused significant reduction in total weed density and weed DMP when compared to unweeded control (Table 1). Directed application of glyphosate @ 0.80 kg ha-1 reduced

 $\textbf{Table 2.} \ \, \textbf{Effect of integrated weed management in weed count, weed DMP,}$ weed control index and growth and vield parameters of cotton

weed control index and growth and yield parameters of cotton										
Treatments	Total weed count m ⁻² on 90 DAS*	Weed DMP on 90 DAS (kg ha ⁻¹)	Weed Control Index (%)	Plant height (cm)	Number of branches plant ⁻¹	Number ofbolls pl <i>a</i> nt ⁻¹	Seed cotton yield (q ha ⁻¹)			
Control	12.52 (156.20)	1210.20	-	71.00	20.52	14.00	5.70			
Hand weeding (HW) Twice at 30 & 60 DAS	4.75 (22.05)	139.42	88.48	137.13	41.00	96.95	24.88			
Glyphosate @ 1.10 kg ha ⁻¹	6.11 (36.78)	235.50	80.54	134.27	32.00	71.00	19.00			
Pendimethalin@ 1.50 kg ha ⁻¹	7.66 (58.25)	357.42	70.46	127.60	30.05	64.20	17.68			
Pendimethalin@ 1.00 kg ha ⁻¹ + HW at 45 DAS	5.20 (26.52)	153.48	87.31	133.72	36.00	80.78	23.20			
Pendimethalin @ 1.00 kg ha ⁻¹ + Glyphosate @ 0.80 kg ha ⁻¹	4.64 (21.00)	133.75	88.95	138.75	42.11	98.15	25.00			
Fluchloralin@ 1.50 kg ha ⁻¹	7.27 (52.29)	341.00	71.82	129.20	32.74	67.00	18.00			
Fluchloralin@ 1.00 kg ha ⁻¹ + HW at 45 DAS	4.93 (24.83)	142.50	88.23	135.00	38.02	83.33	23.66			
Fluchloralin@ 1.00 kg ha ⁻¹ + Glyphosate@ 0.80 kg ha ⁻¹	4.46 (19.39)	124.70	89.70	141.00	43.84	99.18	25.34			
SE _D	4.90	34.51	-	10.41	6.30	8.72	1.25			
CD (p=0.05)	2.91	17.20	-	5.20	3.15	4.36	0.62			

^{*} Original figures in parentheses were subjected to square root transformation before analysis

(124.70 kg ha⁻¹) and increased the WCI (89.70%) systemic action and it made a cover of killed where this herbicide was applied after the preemergence application of fluchloralin@1.00 kg ha⁻¹. This was at par with the pre-emergence application of pendimethalin @ 1.00 kg ha-1 followed by directed application of glyphosate @ 0.80 kg ha⁻¹ and the treatment of hand weeding twice. This might be due to the effective control of all types of weed by the pre-emergence herbicide during the initial stages followed by treatments increased the plant height, number control of all type of weeds by spraying the of sympodial branches plant-1, number of bolls directed application of glyphosate due to its plant-1 and seed cotton yield ha-1 over unweeded

weeds on soil surface which did not allow new weeds to emerge and provided season long control of weeds. This finding is in line with the results of Panwar et al. (2001). Application of preemergence and post-emergence herbicides alone were found to be less effective in reducing weed counts and weed DMP.

Effect on crop: All the weed management

control (Table 2). The pre-emergence application directed application of glyphosate and the pendimethalin followed by post-emergence herbicides alone at higher doses.

of fluchloralin followed by post-emergence treatment of hand weeding twice. This is due to directed application of glyphosate was effective suppression of weed competition by integrated and significantly superior to the rest of treatments weed control treatments offering efficient and by recording highest plant height (141.00 cm), prolonged weed control leading to higher seed number of sympodial branches (43.84 plant⁻¹), cotton yield. Application of pendimethalin and number of bolls (99.18 plant-1) and seed cotton fluchloral in at lower doses in combination with yield (25.34 q ha-1). This treatment was one hand weeding provided significantly higher comparable to the pre-emergence application of seed cotton yields than application of these

REFERENCES

Pense, V.G. and Sukhatme, P.V. (1978). Statistical Methods for Agricultural Workers. 3rd ed. Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi.

Panwar, R.S. et al. (2001). Indian J. Weed Sci., 33: 167-167.

Shelke, D.K. and Bhosle, R.H. (1990). J. Maharashtra Agric. Univ., 15: 257-258.