

# Energy Balance Studies of Weed Management Practices in Mustard (*Brassica juncea*(L.) Czerej and Cosson)

## ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at College Farm, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad during *rabi* 2020-21 on loamy sand soils to study energy balance of weed management practices in mustard. The energy balance studies were determined by using direct and indirect energy. Among the different weed management practices, pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded higher energy input. This treatment was followed by oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>. Maximum energy output, net energy, energy use efficiency and energy productivity were noticed under intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and it was statistically on par with oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb intercultivation at 30 DAS, oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb intercultivation at 30 DAS and pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE fb intercultivation at 30 DAS.

**Keywords:** Energy input; Energy output; Energy efficiency; Energy Productivity; and energy intercultivation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION:

Mustard is one of the most important oilseed crops in terms of worldwide trade. It is a member of the Cruciferae family. It is the second most important oilseed crop in India, after groundnut, among the seven edible oilseeds. Mustard seeds have an oil content ranging from 37 to 49% (Bhowmik *et al.*, 2014). In India, rape seed and mustard occupy 6.23 million ha area with production and productivity of 9.34 million tonnes and 1499 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively (India stat 2019-20). Weeds are the major biotic stress in mustard production.

With the intensification of agriculture, the use of non-farm inputs such as fertilizers, insecticides, herbicides, fungicides and various other chemicals has been increased with the time. The requirement of the energy for these inputs is high. With the increasing crude oil prices

**Comment [U1]:** What does this acronym stand for?

**Comment [U2]:** What does this acronym stand for?

**Comment [U3]:** Adjusted.

**Comment [U4]:** Adjusted. Standardize across all text.

**Comment [U5]:** Adjusted. No recoil. Standardize across all text.

**Comment [U6]:** Citations throughout the text should be numbered, for example [1] and not (Bhowmik *et al.*, 2014).

day by day which in turn increases the price of the external inputs. Thus the cost of cultivation multiplies with the benefits being limited. Hence the calculation of energy inputs and outputs is inevitable. Energy balance is defined as the measurement of proportion as well as analysis of the energy input consumed and output produced out of different activities to find out the direction of energy consumption pattern of a system (Acharya *et al.*, 2013). Keeping this in view, the present experiment was carried out with the objective to study energy balance of weed management practices in mustard. The energy balance studies were carried out for the practices adopted from the start of crop cultivation to the end of harvest.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Study Location, Plant Growing Conditions and Experimental Design

A field experiment was conducted during *rabi* season 2020-21 at College Farm, College of Agriculture, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad. The experimental field's soil had a loamy sand texture and a pH of 7.9 with available nitrogen ( $223 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), available phosphorus ( $30.87 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), available potassium ( $375.72 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and organic carbon (0.69%), it was medium fertile. Mustard variety NRCHB-101 was sown with seed rate of  $4 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ . The seeds were sown manually with spacing of  $40 \text{ cm} \times 10 \text{ cm}$ . Recommended dose of fertilizers 80:40:40  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$  N,  $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$   $\text{K}_2\text{O}$  were applied.

The experiment was laid out in randomised block design replicated thrice with twelve treatments *viz.*, T<sub>1</sub>: Pendimethalin 30 % EC  $1.0 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PE fb quizalofop ethyl 5% EC  $0.05 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PoE, T<sub>2</sub>: Oxadiargyl 6% EC  $0.09 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PE fb quizalofop ethyl 5% EC  $0.05 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PoE, T<sub>3</sub>: Oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC  $0.1 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PE fb quizalofop ethyl 5% EC  $0.05 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PoE, T<sub>4</sub>: Pendimethalin 30 % EC  $1.0 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PE fb straw mulch  $5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$ , T<sub>5</sub>: Oxadiargyl 6% EC  $0.09 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PE fb straw mulch  $5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$ , T<sub>6</sub>: Oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC  $0.1 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PE fb straw mulch  $5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}$ , T<sub>7</sub>: Pendimethalin 30 % EC  $1.0 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  PE fb intercultivation at 30 DAS (days after sowing), T<sub>8</sub>: Oxadiargyl 6%

Comment [U7]: Adjusted. No recoil. Standardize across all text.

Comment [U8]: Insert the geographic coordinates.

Comment [U9]: What does this acronym stand for?

Comment [U10]: What does this acronym stand for?

Comment [U11]: What does this acronym stand for?

Comment [U12]: Is that even the meaning of that acronym?

EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, T<sub>9</sub>: Oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, T<sub>10</sub>: Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS (weed free), T<sub>11</sub>: Intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS, and T<sub>12</sub>: Unweeded control. Pre-emergence herbicides were applied within 24 hours after sowing. All post-emergence herbicides were sprayed at 2-3 leaf stage of weeds. Straw mulch was laid at 15 DAS. Intercultivation was done with push hoe at 15 and 30 DAS. Hand weeding was done at 15 and 30 DAS.

## 2.2 Data Collection

### At the end of the experiment

The observations were noticed on energy input, energy output, net energy, energy efficiency, and energy productivity. Energy input of different treatments was estimated by using direct and indirect energy. Direct energy inputs include total quantity of fossil fuel used in land preparation, harvesting, human labour and electricity whereas indirect energy inputs are energy used in transportation of machinery synthetic fertilizers, pesticides and seed. The indirect energy use of agricultural machinery was calculated by using the equation 1.

$$E_{im} = (MTR \times M) / (L \times C_e) \quad (1)$$

Where,  $E_{im}$  = Machinery input energy (M) ha<sup>-1</sup>

MTR = Energy used to manufacture, transport and repair

M = Mass of machinery (kg)

L = Life of machinery (h)

$C_e$  = Effective field capacity of farm machinery (h ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Energy conversion factors used in the present study are shown in Table 1.

### **Output energy**

**Comment [U13]:** At the end of the experiment, describe the variables evaluated in this study.

**Comment [U14]:** Adjusted. Aligned to the left. Standardize on the other equations.

The seed and stover yields were considered for calculating output energy. Energy output was calculated by multiplying the seed and stover yields with corresponding energy coefficient. Energy efficiencies or intensities of the different weed management treatments were estimated as i) net energy and ii) ratio of output to energy input (Energy use efficiency, EUE).

**Total net energy**

$$NEt = \text{Energy Output} - \text{Energy input}$$

**Total energy use efficiency**

$$EUEt = \frac{\text{Total energy output (MJ ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Energy input (MJ ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

**Total energy productivity**

$$EPt = \frac{\text{Total yield (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Energy input (MJ ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

**Table 1. Energy conversion factors used in the present study**

Input	Energy coefficient	References	
Machinery	MB Plough	22.4 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	Rotavator	23.2 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	Cultivator	20.72 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	Sprayer	3.76 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Pimentel (1993)
Irrigation	Diesel	56.31 MJ l <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)

	Water	1.02 m <sup>3</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	Electricity	11.93 kW h	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	Pump	0.382 kW h ha <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
Manual labour	Men	1.96 MJ man-h <sup>-1</sup>	Mittal and Dhawan (1988)
	Women	1.57 MJ man-h <sup>-1</sup>	Mittal and Dhawan (1988)
Fertilizers	Nitrogen	60.0 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	Phosphorus	11.30 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
	Potassium	6.70 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
Pesticides	Emamectin	228.8 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Green (1987)
	Propiconazole	175 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Guzman and Alanso (2008)
	Oxyfluorfen	551 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Chaudary <i>et al.</i> (2017)
	Oxadiargyl	121.5 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Jha <i>et al.</i> (2020)
	Quizalofop ethyl	518 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Chaudary <i>et al.</i> (2017)
	Pendimethalin	421 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Chaudary <i>et al.</i> (2017)
Seed	Seed	14.70 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
<b>Output</b>			
Grain		14.70 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)
Stover		12.50 MJ kg <sup>-1</sup>	Devasenapathy <i>et al.</i> (2009)

**Comment [U15]:** The tables must be adjusted according to the author guidelines of this Journal.

The same comment applies to the other tables.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Effect on ~~w~~ Weed ~~f~~ Flora

The experimental field was infested with grasses like *Digitaria sanguinalis*, *Chloris barbata*, *Echinochloa crusgalli*, *Cynodon dactylon*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium*, *Dinebra retroflexa*, *Eleusine indica* and sedges like *Cyperus rotundus* and broad-leaved weeds like *Parthenium hysterophorus*, *Alternanthera sessilis*, *Trianthema portulacastrum*, *Cleome viscosa*, *Datura stramonium*, *Euphorbia hirta*, *Commelina benghalensis*, *Sonchus arevensis* and *Digera arvensis*.

### **3.2 Effect on ~~w~~ Weed ~~e~~ Control ~~e~~ Efficiency**

Different weed management practices had impact on weed control efficiency (Table 24). Higher weed control efficiency was observed with intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and this treatment was followed by oxadiargyl 6% EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* straw mulch at 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* straw mulch at 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* straw mulch at 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS. It might be due to effective control of weeds led to reduced weed dry matter resulted in higher weed control efficiency (Singh and Kumar, 2020).

### **3.3 Effect on ~~y~~ Yield**

Data pertaining to yield presented in Table 24. Among weed management practices, Higher seed and stover yield were observed under intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and it was on par with oxadiargyl 6% EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. In turn oxadiargyl 6% EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS on par with oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Effective control of weeds provided congenial environment for crop which resulted in higher yield attributes led to higher yield (Das, 2016).

### **3.4 Energy ~~b~~ Balance ~~s~~ Studies**

**Comment [U16]:** Percent units must be entered without a space. Standardize across all text.

Data pertaining to energy balance studies were presented in Table 32. Among the different weed management practices, pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded highest energy input. This treatment was followed by oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> it might be due to more energy necessary to produce straw mulch.

Higher total energy output was observed with intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and it was statistically on par with oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS in turn on par with oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS and pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS.

Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS was recorded significantly higher net energy and it was found to be on par with oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS in turn on par with oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS.

Significantly superior energy use efficiency (EUE) of total output was recorded under intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS and it was statistically on par with oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS and pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS.

Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS was recorded highest energy productivity (EP) of total output and it was statistically on par with oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS, oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS and pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* intercultivation at 30 DAS. Similar results were noticed by Jha *et al.* (2020).

#### **4. CONCLUSIONS**

In case of energy balance studies, maximum energy input was required for pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> PE *fb* straw mulch 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>.

Higher energy output, net energy, energy use efficiency and energy productivity were recorded under intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 and 30 DAS.

**Comment [U17]:** This is a repeat of the results. Therefore, rephrase the conclusions.

**Table 21.** Weed control efficiency (%) and yield ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) as influenced by integrated weed management practices in mustard

Treatments	Weed control efficiency (%)	Seed yield ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )	Stover yield ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )
T <sub>1</sub> : Pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> quizalofop ethyl 5 % EC 0.05 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PoE	80.63	895	2596
T <sub>2</sub> : Oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> quizalofop ethyl 5 % EC 0.05 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PoE	82.12	917	2668
T <sub>3</sub> : Oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> quizalofop ethyl 5 % EC 0.05 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PoE	81.33	908	2634
T <sub>4</sub> : Pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t $\text{ha}^{-1}$	85.46	1084	2878
T <sub>5</sub> : Oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t $\text{ha}^{-1}$	86.46	1104	2938
T <sub>6</sub> : Oxyfluorfen at 23.5 % EC 0.1 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t $\text{ha}^{-1}$	85.97	1092	2897
T <sub>7</sub> : Pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	90.29	1267	3098
T <sub>8</sub> : Oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	92.72	1349	3149
T <sub>9</sub> : Oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	90.77	1320	3115

T <sub>10</sub> : Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 DAS and 30 DAS (weed free)	94.77	1483	3280
<b>Treatments</b>	<b>EI</b>	<b>Eot</b>	<b>Net</b>
		<b>EUEt</b>	<b>Ept</b>

T <sub>11</sub> : Intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS	84.52	1070	2799
T <sub>12</sub> : Unweeded control	-	641	2413
SE (m) ±		47.7	48.7
CD (P=0.05)		140.0	142.8

**Table 2. Energetics as influenced by integrated weed management practices in mustard**

	(MJ ha <sup>-1</sup> )			(kg MJ <sup>-1</sup> )	
T <sub>1</sub> : Pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> quizalofop ethyl 5 % EC 0.05 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PoE	19423	45748	26325	2.36	0.180
T <sub>2</sub> : Oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> quizalofop ethyl 5 % EC 0.05 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PoE	19013	46970	27958	2.47	0.189
T <sub>3</sub> : Oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> quizalofop ethyl 5 % EC 0.05 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PoE	19157	46422	27265	2.42	0.185
T <sub>4</sub> : Pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	41944	52058	10114	1.24	0.094
T <sub>5</sub> : Oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	41534	53100	11566	1.28	0.097
T <sub>6</sub> : Oxyfluorfen at 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> straw mulch 5 t ha <sup>-1</sup>	41578	52413	10835	1.26	0.096
T <sub>7</sub> : Pendimethalin 30 % EC 1.0 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	19588	57483	37895	2.93	0.223
T <sub>8</sub> : Oxadiargyl 6 % EC 0.09 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	19178	60338	41160	3.15	0.235
T <sub>9</sub> : Oxyfluorfen 23.5 % EC 0.1 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> PE <i>fb</i> intercultivation at 30 DAS	19223	58488	39266	3.04	0.231
T <sub>10</sub> : Intercultivation and hand weeding at 15 DAS and 30 DAS (weed free)	19315	62945	43630	3.26	0.247
T <sub>11</sub> : Intercultivation at 15 and 30 DAS	19202	50862	31660	2.65	0.202
T <sub>12</sub> : Unweeded control	18988	22736	3748	1.20	0.161
SE (m) ±		1198.5	1200.3	0.13	0.01
CD (P=0.05)		3595.1	3602.0	0.40	0.03

**EI: energy input, Eot: total energy output, Net: total net energy, EUEt: total energy use efficiency, Ept: total energyproductivity**

## REFERENCES

**Comment [U18]:** References must be inserted in the same citation order throughout the text.

- Acharya, S.K., Bera, S and Ahmad, G. 2013. Estimation of farm energy balances of small farm management: a social-ecological and techno managerial analysis. *Journal of Crop and Weed*. **9**(2): 91-95.
- Bhowmik, B., Mitra, B and Bhadra, K. 2014. Diversity of insect pollinators and their effect on the crop yield of *Brassica juncea* L., NPJ-93, from Southern West Bengal. *International Journal of Recent Scientist Research*. **5** (6): 1207-1213.
- Chaudary, K.K., Singh, S.S., Pratibha, G., Ranjan, B., Shamim, M., Srinivas, L and Patel, A. 2017. Energy conservation and greenhouse gas mitigation under different production systems in rice cultivation. *Energy*. **130**: 307-314.
- Das, S. K. 2016. Chemical weed management in *Brassica rapa* variety yellow sarson. *Journal of Applied and Natural Science*. **8** (2): 663-667.
- Devasenapathy, P., Senthil Kumar, G and Shanmugam, P.M. 2009. Energy management in crop production. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. **54** (1): 80-90.
- Green, M.B. 1987. Energy in pesticide manufacture, distribution and use. In *Energy in Plant Nutrition and Pest Control*, ed. Z.R. Helsel, 165-177. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier.
- Guzman, G.J and Alonso, A.M. 2008. A comparison of energy use in conventional and organic olive oil production in Spain. *Agricultural Systems*. **49**: 1-10.
- India statistics 2019-20 ([indiastat.com](http://indiastat.com)).
- Jha, S.K., Dewangan, Y.K and Jha, D. 2020. Effect of weed management practices and seed rates on economics and energetics on direct seeded rice production system. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. **9** (5):677-681.
- Mittal, J.P and Dhawan, K.C. 1988. Energy-use patterns under various farming systems in Punjab. *Applied energy*. **30**(4): 261-268.
- Pimentel, D. 1993. Economics and energetics of organic and conventional fanning. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*. **6**: 53-60.
- Rathke, G.W., Wienhold, B.J., Wilhelm, W.W and Diepenbrock, W. 2007. Tillage and rotation effect on corn-soybean energy balances in eastern Nebraska. *Soil and Tillage*

*Research*.**97**:60-70.

Singh, L and Kumar, S. 2020. Effect of integrated weed management on weed and growth attributing characters of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Journal of Oilseed Brassica*.**11**(1):62-68.

UNDER PEER REVIEW