



Weed Growth and Productivity of Greengram (*Vigna radiata* L.) under Different Weed Control Practices

Chiranjib Barik ^{a*}, Koushik Sar ^a, Ipsita Padhi ^a,
N Barsha ^a and Avishek Pradhan ^b

^a Department of Agronomy, FAS, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan University, Bhubaneswar, Odisha (751 029), India.

^b Department of Agronomy, Institute of Agriculture, Visva-Bharati, Sriniketan, West Bengal, (731 236), India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2024/v36i95017>

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/123639>

Original Research Article

Received: 11/07/2024

Accepted: 14/09/2024

Published: 20/09/2024

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted during summer season 2022 and 2023 to study the weed growth and productivity of greengram under different herbicidal treatments at agricultural research station, faculty of agricultural sciences, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India to study the effect of different weed control practices on weed growth and productivity of greengram. The experiment conducted under eight treatments viz., pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ at 1 DAS, imazethapyr 75 g ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS, pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ at 1 DAS, quizalofop ethyl 50 g ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS, fenoxaprop-p-ethyl 50 g ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS, acifluorfen Na 16.5%+clodinafoppropargyl 8% 245 g ha⁻¹

*Corresponding author: E-mail: barikchiranjib3@gmail.com;

Cite as: Barik, Chiranjib, Koushik Sar, Ipsita Padhi, N Barsha, and Avishek Pradhan. 2024. "Weed Growth and Productivity of Greengram (*Vigna Radiata* L.) under Different Weed Control Practices". *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science* 36 (9):683-89. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2024/v36i95017>.

at 20 DAS, two hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and weedy check, were replicated thrice in the randomized block design. The findings showed that two hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS registered significantly lowest weed density and biomass among the weed control practices and it was at par with pre-emergence application of ready-mix pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha⁻¹. Weed competition resulted in 58.17% reduction in grain yield of greengram. Two hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS recorded the highest seed and stover yield of greengram along with higher growth attributing characters like plant height, dry matter production and branches plant⁻¹ and it was closely followed by application of ready-mix pendimethalin+imazethapyr at 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ PE.

Keywords: Greengram; weed flora; seed yield; herbicides; pendimethalin+imazethapyr.

1. INTRODUCTION

Food legumes are often acknowledged as poor man's meat. In India, they constitute a comparatively less expensive source of dietary protein. Pulses are an excellent source of critical amino acids, vitamins, fiber, iron, zinc, and magnesium, among other vital minerals and nutrients to human health (Yadav et al., 2017). Among the pulses, green gram (*Vignaradiata*(L.) Wilczek) enjoys significant consumer preference due to its palatability and nutritious levels (Nirmala et al., 2018). During the summer and rainy seasons, weeds are the main factor that reduces mungbean yield [1]. According to Singh et al. [2], weed competition in green grams is expected to occur during the first 30 days of sowing. "The total annual agricultural production losses were mainly caused by weeds (45%), followed by insects (30%), diseases (20%), and other causes (5%)" [3]. Effective weed management practices are more critical for green gram cultivation. Summer greengram often faces intense crop-weed competition, mainly when grown in an irrigated environment [4]. "A major obstacle to growing more summer greengram is weed infestation since weeds compete with crop plants for nutrients, moisture, light, and space. Weeds are a significant challenge to its production since they grow more quickly. The initial 70–80% of crop development occurs within the first 20–30 days after sowing. Hence, pre-emergence herbicides are of paramount importance during the initial growth period. Pre-emergence herbicides prevent weeds from emerging, creating an ideal habitat for growth in weed-free conditions" [5]. The weeds that appear during the critical growth period must also be suppressed to prevent weed flushing. This can be done by hand weeding, using post-emergence herbicides, or doing interculture activities. This all-encompassing strategy guarantees that every growth stage is efficiently controlled to optimize yields within the allotted time frame. With this background the present

experiment was conducted to study the effect of different weed control practices on weed growth and productivity of greengram.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted in the summer of 2022 and 2023 at the Agricultural Research Station, Binjhagiri, Chatabar, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, Odisha, India. The research farm is located within the East and South Eastern Coastal Plain Agroclimatic Zone of Odisha. The soil of the experimental plot was sandy loam in texture with pH 5.4, low in organic carbon (0.43%), available nitrogen (230 kg ha⁻¹), available phosphorus (21 kg ha⁻¹) and medium in available potassium (143 kg ha⁻¹). "The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with eight treatments viz. pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ PE at 1 DAS, post-emergence application (PoE) of imazethapyr 75 g ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS, pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ PE at 1 DAS, quizalofop ethyl 50 g ha⁻¹PoE at 20 DAS, fenoxaprop-ethyl 50 g ha⁻¹PoE at 20 DAS, sodium-acifluorfen Na 16.5%+clodinafop-propargyl 8% 245 g ha⁻¹PoE at 20 DAS, hand weeding twice at 15 and 30 DAS and weedy check. The cultivar of greengram was Virat, and recommended dose of fertilizer was 20-40-20 kg ha⁻¹ N, P₂O₅ and K₂O, respectively. Herbicide was applied using a knapsack sprayer and the spray volume was 500l of water ha⁻¹. Weed density was assessed at 40 days after sowing (DAS) using a 50x50 cm quadrat (0.25 m²) randomly placed within the sampling area. The weeds were cleaned by rinsing with water, exposed to sunlight for several hours, and subsequently dried in a hot air oven at 72°C for 72 hours" [5]. The experimental data relating to each character of crop and weed were analyzed by the technique of "Analysis of variance" using MSTAT. The pooled analysis of two year's data on weed growth and crop parameters has been done and presented in tables. The weed data

were subjected to a square root transformation to normalize their distribution.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Effect on Weed

The prominent weed flora viz. *Poa annua*, *Digitariasanguinalis* and *Echinochloa colona* among the grasses and *Cleome viscosa* and *Melochiacorchorifolia* among the broadleaved weeds were observed throughout the crop growing period in experiment field. Similar weed flora in greengram has also been reported by Aliveniet al. [6], Kavadet al. [7], Jingeret al. [8].

Two hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS recorded the lowest density and dry weight of grasses, broadleaved, and total weeds at 40 DAS, and it was at par with the pre-emergence application of premix pendimethalin+imazethapyr at 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ (Table 2). Kunduet al. [9] reported that hand weeding twice at 15 and 30 days after sowing had shown a maximum reduction of grasses in greengram. Application of ready-mix pendimethalin+imazethapyr recorded 49.23% and 46.55% lower density and 65.64% and 59.60% lower biomass of total weeds compared to sole application of pendimethalin at 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ and imazethapyr at 75 g ha⁻¹ respectively (Table 2).

At the initial stage of crop growth, the treatments post emergence application of quizalofop ethyl and fenoxaprop-p-ethyl registered a lower population of grassy weeds. Though the herbicide fenoxaprop-p-ethyl is a grass killer, the weed species *Digitariasanguinalis* was not controlled by the herbicide. Similar observations were made by Mundra and Maliwal (2012).

3.2 Effect on Green Gram

The maximum plant height, branches plant⁻¹, and dry matter production were recorded under two hand weeding twice at harvest, and it was at par with pre-mix pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ PE (Table 1). Pre-emergence application of premix pendimethalin+imazethapyr recorded a 9.84% and 13.41% higher number of branch plant⁻¹ at harvest compared to the sole application of imazethapyr and pendimethalin, respectively, at harvest. Chhodavadia et al. [10] reported that two hand weeding significantly increase number of branches plant⁻¹ compared to unweeded condition in summer greengram

[11,12]. This might be due to severe competition by weeds for resources, which made the crop plant inefficient in taking up more moisture and nutrients, and ultimately, growth was adversely affected due to a lower supply of carbohydrates. At harvest, the application of pendimethalin + imazethapyr recorded 14.71% and 19.24% higher values of dry matter accumulation than the sole application of imazethapyr and pendimethalin, respectively. Imazethapyr at 75 g ha⁻¹ and pendimethalin at 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ were recorded at par value of dry matter accumulation at harvest [13,14].

Two-hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS registered the highest seed and stover yield than other treatments, but it was at par with the pre-emergence application of premix pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ (Table 2). The lowest seed and stover yield was recorded under weedy check plots [15,16] Pre-emergence application of ready-mix pendimethalin+imazethapyr recorded 13.26% and 18.97% higher seed yield than sole application of pre-emergence pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ and post emergence imazethapyr 75 g ha⁻¹. [17-19]. Weed check plots recorded 58.17% and 57.07% lower seed yield of greengram in compared to two hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and ready-mix pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ respectively. The competition between green gram and weeds for nutrients, water, light, and space was less under the above treatments, which facilitated greater utilization of sunlight, higher synthesis of photosynthates, and better partitioning towards seed formation, ultimately leading to higher seed yield of green gram. Singh et al. [20] also reported that among the herbicides, pre-emergence application of pre-mix pendimethalin+imazethapyr at 1.0 and 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ recorded higher seed yield (1.41 and 1.31 t ha⁻¹, respectively).

3.3 Impact Assessment

The least amount of weed persistence was observed with two-hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS. Acifluorfen Na 16.5%+Clodinafoppropargyl 8% 245 g ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS had the greatest weed management index (Agronomic management index and Integrated weed management index), followed by Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl 50 g ha⁻¹ at 20 DAS. Moreover, Pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ at 1 DAS had the lowest weed index.

Table 1. Weed density and biomass at 40 DAS as influenced by different weed control practices in greengram (pooled data)

Treatment	Weed density (No. m ⁻²) at 40 DAS			Weed biomass (g m ⁻²) at 40 DAS		
	Grasses	Broad leaved	Total	Grasses	Broad leaved	Total
Pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha ⁻¹ at 1 DAS	2.26 (4.67)	2.76 (7.33)	3.51 (12.00)	2.03 (3.64)	3.13 (9.40)	3.66 (13.04)
Imazethapyr 75 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	2.54 (6.00)	2.11 (4.00)	3.23 (10.00)	2.19 (4.32)	2.69 (6.77)	3.40 (11.09)
Pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha ⁻¹ at 1 DAS	1.68 (2.33)	1.46 (1.67)	2.11 (4.00)	1.48 (1.71)	1.80 (2.10)	2.22 (4.48)
Quizalofop ethyl 50 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	3.19 (9.67)	3.38 (11.00)	4.59 (20.67)	2.43 (5.43)	3.86 (13.44)	4.50 (19.87)
Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl 50 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	3.28 (11.00)	3.57 (12.33)	4.88 (23.33)	2.63 (6.55)	4.01 (14.66)	4.77 (22.22)
Acifluorfen Na 16.5%+Clodinafop propargyl 8% 245 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	3.75 (13.67)	3.89 (14.67)	5.37 (28.33)	3.04 (8.80)	4.32 (17.22)	5.25 (27.02)
Two hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS	1.56 (2.00)	1.34 (1.33)	1.93 (3.33)	1.38 (1.41)	1.44 (1.59)	1.87 (3.00)
Weedy check	5.04 (25.00)	4.63 (21.00)	6.82 (46.00)	4.77 (22.41)	5.24 (27.00)	7.06 (49.41)
S.Em (±)	0.17	0.19	0.16	0.16	0.18	0.16
CD (p=0.05)	0.52	0.58	0.51	0.50	0.54	0.49

Figures in parentheses are the original values. The data was transformed to SQRT ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) before analysis

Table 2. Effect of weed control practices on growth and yield of greengram (pooled data)

Treatment	Plant height (cm)	Branches plant ⁻¹	Dry matter accumulation (g m ⁻²)	Seed Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Stover Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)
Pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha ⁻¹ at 1 DAS	36.82	7.38	211.33	881.11	2724.44
Imazethapyr 75 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	37.17	7.62	219.67	925.56	2778.89
Pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha ⁻¹ at 1 DAS	41.17	8.37	252.00	1048.33	3231.66
Quizalofop ethyl 50 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	36.14	6.71	188.00	760.56	2390.56
Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl 50 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	34.71	6.46	177.67	741.67	2318.33
Acifluorfen Na 16.5%+Clodinafoppropargy I 8% 245 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	33.81	5.74	165.67	712.22	2267.56
Two hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS	42.27	8.88	263.67	1076.11	3276.11
Weedy check	24.19	4.65	113.33	450.06	1698.06
S.Em (±)	1.14	0.19	5.23	38.82	110.73
CD (p=0.05)	3.46	0.58	15.46	117.75	335.89

Table 3. impact assessment indices of different treatments

Treatment	WI (%)	WPI	WMI	AMI	IWMI
Pendimethalin 0.75 kg ha ⁻¹ at 1 DAS	18.12	1.01	4.07	3.07	5.60
Imazethapyr 75 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	13.99	1.02	3.97	2.97	5.45
Pendimethalin+imazethapyr 0.75 kg ha ⁻¹ at 1 DAS	2.58	1.02	3.40	2.40	4.60
Quizalofop ethyl 50 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	29.32	0.95	4.66	3.66	6.49
Fenoxaprop-p-ethyl 50 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	31.08	0.94	5.08	4.08	7.12
Acifluorfen Na 16.5%+Clodinafoppropargy I 8% 245 g ha ⁻¹ at 20 DAS	33.82	0.94	6.17	5.17	8.76
Two hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS	0.00	0.94	3.25	2.25	4.38

WI, Weed Index; WPI, Weed Persistence Index; WMI, Weed Management Index; AMI, Agronomic Management Index; IWMI, Integrated Weed Management Index

4. CONCLUSION

On the basis of two year experiment we can be concluded that application of ready-mix pendimethalin+imazethapyrat 0.75 kg ha⁻¹ appeared to be promising for effective weed management and higher productivity in summer greengram.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of this manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Singh K, Ram H, Kumar R, Meena RK, Kumar R, Manisha. Effect of weed management practices on weed dynamics, nutrient depletion, productivity and profitability of summer mungbean (*Vignaradiata*) under zero tillage condition. Legume Research; 2021. DOI: 10.18805/LR-4497
2. Singh G, Virk HK, Khanna V. Pre and post-emergence herbicides effect on growth, nodulation and productivity of green gram. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2019;5(3):257-261.
3. Ghorai AK, Patsa R, Jash S, Dutta S. Microbial secondary metabolites and their role in stress management of plants. Biocontrol Agents and Secondary Metabolites Applications and Immunization for Plant Growth and Protection. West Bengal, India. 2020;283-319.
4. Mukherjee D. Food security: A worldwide challenge. Research and Review: Journal of Agriculture and Allied Sciences. 2015; 4(1):3-5.
5. Mohanty P, Sar K, Duary B, Mishra G. Effect of sole and ready-mix herbicides on weeds and productivity of summer greengram in Odisha. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2023;55(1):50-53.
6. Aliveni A, Rao AS, Ramana AV, Jagannadham J. Management of common vetch and other weeds in relay crop of blackgram. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2016;48(3):341-342.
7. Kavadi NB, Patel CK, Patel AR, Thumber BR. Integrated weed management in blackgram. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2016;48(2):222-224.
8. Jinger D, Sharma R, Sepat S. Weed biomass and yield of greengram (*Vignaradiata*) as affected by sequential application of herbicides in Indo-Gangetic Plains. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2016;86(3):418-422.
9. Kundu R, Bera PS, Brahmachari K, Mallick R. Integrated weed management in greengram [*Vignaradiata* (L.) Wilczek] under Gangetic alluvial soil of West Bengal. Journal of Botanical Society of Bengal. 2011;65(1):35-43.
10. Chhodavadia SK, Mathukiya RK, Dobariya VK. Pre- and post-emergence herbicides for integrated weed management in summer greengram. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2013;45(2):137-139.
11. Business Standard. Business Standard., India is 102 in Hunger Index of 117 nations, undoing decade of improvement; 2019.
12. Choudhary AK, Raje RS, Datta S, Sultana R, Ontagodi T. Conventional and molecular approaches towards genetic improvement in pigeon pea for insects resistance. American Journal of Plant Sciences. 2023; 4:372- 385.
13. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. Wiley India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India; 2010.
14. Gopakumar S, Menon MV. Integrated weed management in green gram [*Vignaradiata* (L.) Wilczek]. Journal of Tropical Agriculture. 2022;60(1):144-149.
15. Mirjha PR, Saroj KP, Manoj KS, Chandra MD. Efficacy of different weed management strategies in mungbean. International Agronomy Congress, New Delhi. 2012;2(3):130-131.
16. Mundra SL, Maliwal PL. Influence of quizalofop-ethyl on narrow-leaved weeds in blackgram and its residual effect on succeeding crops. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2012; 44(4):231-234.
17. Sing R, Sing G. Weed management in greengram: A review. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2020;52(1):10-20.
18. Singh G, Virk HK, Sharma P. Efficacy of pre- and post-emergence herbicides for weed

- control in greengram. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2017;49(3):252-255.
19. Verma SK, Prasad SK, Singh SB, Singh YV, Singh RP, Bahadur S. Influence of mulching and weed management practices on weeds and nutrient uptake in greengram (*Vignarediata* L.) under eight year old custard apple plantation. International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management. 2017;8(2):191–195.
20. Singh UP, Mishra JS, Singh SP, Singh MK, Dahiphale AV, Kashyap SK, Kumar S. Viable weed management options for sustainable crop production, 57. In: Proceedings of Biennial Conference on “Doubling Farmers’ Income by 2022: The Role of Weed Science”, Udaipur, India; 2017.

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/123639>