

## Original Research Article

### **Efficacy Effect of different weed management practices on growth and yield of cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata* L.)**

#### **Abstract**

~~As Cabbage-cabbage is cultivated with wide spacing, it is prone to profuse due to a wider spaced crop becomes susceptible to weed infestations, causing resulting in reduced crop yields and subsequent significant economic losses. and reduced crop yields. Reducing these losses due to weeds in this crop becomes essential. To counter this problem a~~ field experiment ~~comparing different weed management treatments namely T<sub>1</sub> (two hand weedings), T<sub>2</sub> (paddy straw mulch), T<sub>3</sub> (Pre-emergent application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha), T<sub>4</sub> (Pre-emergent application of pendimethalin @ 1.5 kg a.i./ha), T<sub>5</sub> (Pre-emergence application of pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha + HW at 35 DAT), T<sub>6</sub> (Pre-emergence application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha + hand weeding at 35 DAT), T<sub>7</sub> (Weed-free) and T<sub>8</sub> (Weedy check) was conducted to find-evaluate their efficacy of various weed management practices on growth, yield and economics of cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata* L.).~~ ~~The field experiment was conducted in a randomized block design with three replications and eight weed management treatments.~~ The results revealed that ~~under crop studies~~ the maximum value of plant height, number of unwrapped leaves, fresh weight of heads, dry weight of heads and yield per hectare was obtained ~~in plots~~ under treatment T<sub>7</sub> (weed free). Similarly, in terms of weed parameters minimum weed count, weed dry weight, weed control efficiency and maximum weed index were observed in treatment T<sub>7</sub> (weed free). Maximum net return and benefit: cost ratio was observed under the treatment T<sub>5</sub> (~~Pre-emergent PE~~ application of pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha + one ~~HW hand weeding~~ at 35 DAT), making it an economically practical option for controlling weeds in cabbage.

**Keywords:** Cabbage, herbicides, pendimethalin, weed index, yield.

#### **Introduction**

~~Cabbage, scientifically known as (*Brassica oleracea* var *capitata* L.), is one of the most important members of the Cole group of vegetables belonging to the family Brassicaceae. It is a nutrient rich versatile vegetable with distinct round or oval shaped heads formed by tightly packed leaves. It has been cultivated as a staple in many cuisines worldwide for centuries. It is highly regarded for its nutritional value, versatility in culinary applications, and ease of cultivation. The popularity of cabbage is not surprising, considering its impressive nutritional profile. Packed with essential vitamins, minerals and dietary fibre, cabbage offers a range of health benefits. It is an essential source of vitamin C, vitamin K, vitamin B6, folate, calcium~~

**Comment [GN1]:** Please include the treatments were on par in such parameters, in the results here. Refer to the comments in Table 1

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Formatted:** Font: Italic

~~potassium and manganese~~. In India, it was grown on 0.42 m ha with a production of 9.825 m tones. Major cabbage-producing states in India include West Bengal, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh and Gujrat (Anonymous 2022).

Farmers can face a substantial yield and economic loss due to weeds in cabbage if not controlled in a timely manner. Weeds can reduce cabbage yields by up to 94.59 percent (Akshatha 2018). They not only reduce the yield by increasing crop competition but also by acting as a host for pathogens and insects. ~~Due to this problem, understanding the various weed management practices and their impact on cabbage growth and yield becomes very important.~~

~~Due to its popularity among farmers, cabbage requires cost-effective and efficient weed control methods to meet the high demand.~~ Farmers typically have multiple options for weed control and their decision on which method to use is heavily influenced by economic factors (Singh et al. 2019). Weeds can be controlled by traditional cultural practices like hand weeding and use of mulching. Hand weeding is an effective approach for maintaining weed population but ~~it is not very acceptable often becomes impractical and uneconomical~~ due to high labour costs and ~~availability in time factors~~. Herbicides provide good weed control in the early season by inhibiting and slowing down their growth but due to the widespread use of herbicides ~~natural environments are getting polluted, the ensuing environmental pollution~~ and its damaging effects ~~have started to appear~~ in soil, water and the environment ~~have been on the rise~~ (Ustuner et al. 2020). Herbicide reliance ~~should may~~ be reduced by combining it with other approaches. Therefore, it becomes important to ~~select develop~~ an integrated approach that not ~~only only effectively manages the weeds to~~ reduce the yield and economic losses but also establishes a sustainable agriculture approach by ~~reducing mitigating~~ environmental risks. ~~Thus, by keeping these points in view the present study was planned to determine the effect of different weed management practices on growth, yield and economics of cabbage~~

Formatted: Font: Italic

## Materials and methods

A field experiment was conducted during Rabi 2021-22 at the agriculture research farm of Abhilashi University at Mandi (H.P.) to find the effect of various weed management treatments on growth and yield of cabbage. The soil of the experimental field was low in available nitrogen, medium in available phosphorus and potassium content. RBD design was laid out in 3 replications with the combination of 8 treatments namely, T<sub>1</sub> (HW) respectively at 25 and 45 DAT), T<sub>2</sub> (paddy straw mulch), T<sub>3</sub> (PE application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha), T<sub>4</sub> (PE application of pendimethalin @ 1.5 kg a.i./ha), T<sub>5</sub> (PE application of pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha + HW at 35 DAT), T<sub>6</sub> (PE application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha + HW at 35 DAT), T<sub>7</sub> (Weed-free) and T<sub>8</sub> (Weedy check). ~~To prepare the experimental field, two ploughings followed by planking was practiced. Layout was formed by making of plots of Plot size was 3 m × 2 m. Fertilizers were applied as per recommendation. Appropriate amounts of fertilizers were applied in the plots by calculating their respective~~

Comment [GN2]: Please expand the word, when used for the first time in the text.

Comment [GN3]: Please expand

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [GN4]:

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Highlight

doses. Nitrogen (120 kg/ha) in the form of urea in two equal splits i.e., half before transplanting and the remaining half after one month of transplanting while full dose of phosphorus (75 kg/ha) in the form of single super phosphate and potassium (85 kg/ha) in the form of muriate of potash was applied before transplanting. Thirty days old seedlings were transplanted at a distance of 60 cm × 45 cm followed by irrigating the seedlings irrigation. Gap filling was carried out 10 days after transplanting gap filling was done in order to maintain the plant population.

The required amount of herbicide treatment wise was applied using 750 litres volume of water per hectare with the help of a knapsack sprayer. The required chemical was calculated using the formula:

$$\text{Chemical required} = \frac{a.i/ha}{\%EC} \times 100$$

Formatted: Font: Italic

Pre-emergence herbicides oxyfluorfen and pendimethalin were sprayed uniformly one day after transplanting the cabbage seedlings. Mulching was done by covering the soil properly by spreading a uniform layer of paddy straw. Hand weeding operations were carried out as per the treatment.

For taking observations Observations were made on five pre-tagged plants were selected from each plot and were tagged. The observations were recorded for growth and yield parameters viz., plant height, number of unwrapped leaves per plant, fresh weight of heads, dry weight of heads and yield per plot. Weed parameters recorded were weed count, weed dry weight, weed control efficiency and weed index. For taking the assessment of dry weight, weeds within 0.25 m<sup>2</sup> area were uprooted, cleaned and dried at a temperature of 80 °C until constant weight is achieved. Weed control efficiency was recorded by as per the formula suggested by Mani et al. (1973) and weed index (WI) was derived using the formula suggested by Gill and Kumar (1996) was used to calculate the weed index (WI). Prior to performing statistical analysis, the density of weeds and dry weight data underwent a square root ( $\sqrt{x + 0.5}$ ) transformation to enhance the homogeneity of variance for ANOVA. The economics was worked out on the basis of prevailing market prices.

## Results and discussion

Formatted: Highlight

### Growth and yield parameters

The data on growth parameters presented in Table 1 reveals that at 30 DAT the plant height was not significantly affected by different weed control treatments. Whereas, significantly taller plants (22.36 cm on 60 DAT and 27.34 cm at harvest) and maximum number of leaves (15.47) were recorded in treatment T<sub>7</sub> (weed free) followed by treatment T<sub>6</sub> (PE application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha + one HW at 35 DAT) while minimum values of these parameters were recorded under treatment T<sub>8</sub> (Weedy check). The increase in growth parameters in case of treatment T<sub>7</sub> (weed free) could be due to the absence of weeds during the crop growth period while on the other hand weeds reduced the plant growth in treatment T<sub>8</sub> (Weedy check)

Comment [GN5]: Please refer to the comments made in the table 1 and make the suitable changes in the text. In many cases, T<sub>6</sub>, T<sub>7</sub> and T<sub>8</sub> are statistically on par. Highlight that fact.

Formatted: Font: Italic

due to the increase in crop weed competition for nutrients, sunlight exposure and water. Findings are in conformity with the results of Sen *et al.* (2018) and Patil *et al.* (2022).

In case of yield parameters (Table 1) ~~like such as~~ head fresh weight, head dry weight and yield per hectare different weed management treatments performed significantly better than treatment T<sub>8</sub> (weedy check). Highest values of head fresh weight (522.97 g), head dry weight (42.61 g) and yield/ha (188.63 q) were recorded under treatment T<sub>7</sub> (weed free) which was followed by treatment T<sub>6</sub> (PE application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha + one HW at 35 DAT). The high value of these parameters in these treatments might be due to the maximum availability of assimilates (light, moisture, nutrients and space) to the crop because of less crop weed competition. This resulted in an increase in the dry matter of crop and ultimately the yield. Sen *et al.* (2018), Atal *et al.* (2021) and Patil *et al.* (2022) observed similar results.

### Weed studies

~~Table 2 reveals a remarkable influence of different weed control treatments on data related to could be observed on~~ weed count and weed dry weight (Table 2). Treatment T<sub>7</sub> (weed free) recorded the minimum number of weeds (0.00/0.25 m<sup>2</sup> at 25, 60 DAT and at harvest) and dry weight of weeds (0.0/0.25 m<sup>2</sup>); it was followed by treatment T<sub>6</sub> (PE application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha + one HW at 35 DAT). ~~Whereas, maximum values of these parameters were obtained under treatment T<sub>8</sub> (Weedy check). This might be due to the fact that in weedy check plots, weeds were present throughout the crop growing season and also dry weight of weeds was taken at the end, which let weeds to occupy a good amount of space and obtain good growth, ultimately leading to increased dry matter accumulation.~~ Previous workers, Kumar (2015), Sen *et al.* (2018), Kaur *et al.* (2021) and Patil *et al.* (2022) reported similar results. Maximum weed control efficiency (100%) was recorded in treatment T<sub>7</sub> (weed free) followed by treatment T<sub>6</sub> (PE application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha + one HW at 35 DAT). Minimum value of this parameter was recorded under treatment T<sub>8</sub> (weedy check). From the results, it is evident that treatments that control weeds effectively consequently resulted in a higher percentage of weed control efficiency. Findings are in similarity to the results of Kumar (2014), Sen *et al.*

(2018) and Patil *et al.* (2022). In terms of weed index lowest values were obtained under treatment T<sub>7</sub> (weed free) followed by treatment T<sub>6</sub> (PE application of oxyfluorfen @ 1 kg a.i./ha + one HW at 35 DAT). The maximum weed index was recorded under the treatment T<sub>8</sub> (weedy check). ~~Reason for the low weed index in these treatments could be due to the lower impact of weeds on yields. Findings are comparable to the results of~~ Similar results have been reported by Sen *et al.* (2018) and Patil *et al.* (2022).

### Economics

The success of any practice hinges on ~~experimentation and~~ its financial viability. ~~Even if a treatment is deemed superior, farmers may reject it if it doesn't yield satisfactory financial gains.~~ To assess the

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [GN6]: Please refer to the comments in the table 1 and make the corresponding changes in the text.

Formatted: Font: Italic, Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

economic benefits of different treatments, the marketable yield of the crop ~~is converted into~~ was converted as monetary returns. ~~Data in Table 2 indicates that the~~ The highest net income (~~₹ 167197~~) and benefit: cost ratio (~~Table 2~~) (~~1.84~~) was obtained under treatment T<sub>5</sub> (PE application of pendimethalin @ 1 kg a.i./ha + one HW at 35 DAT). Lowest net income and B: C ratio was obtained from treatment T<sub>8</sub> (weedy check). Though the weedfree treatment resulted in better weed control and higher head yield, the net return and B:C ratio were still low due to the ~~increased need~~ higher cost involved for human labour and the high cost of cultivation. ~~Several workers have reported similar~~ findings (Sen *et al.*, (2018); Gupta *et al.*, (2020); and Patil *et al.*, (2022) reported similar results.

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

## Conclusion

From the study it may be concluded that ~~keeping field~~ weed free was effective for controlling weeds and ~~get-attain~~ higher yields but due to higher labour requirements and higher costs involved this method could not be considered. ~~As-Though several treatments promoted growth and yield characters equally,~~ the benefit: cost ratio was recorded higher ~~under-for the~~ treatment T<sub>5</sub> (pendimethalin 1 kg a.i. /ha + one HW at 35 DAT) it can be considered for controlling weeds in cabbage.

Comment [GN7]: Please refer to the comments in table 1 and modify suitably.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Font: Italic

## References

1. Anonymous. Department of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare, horticulture statistics. 2022. <https://agricoop.nic.in/en/StatHortEst>.
2. Atal MK, Verma RB, Singh VK, Haque MM, Kumar A, Singh SN. Effect of intercropping and weed management practices on growth and yield of cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata*). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2021;10(8): 1719-1724.
3. Akshatha V, Prameela KP, Narayankutty C, Menon MV. Weed management in cabbage (*Brassica oleraceae* var. *capitata* L.). Journal of Tropical Agriculture. 2018;56(2):187-190.
4. Gill GS, Kumar V. Weed index, a new method for reporting weed control trials. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 1969;4: 96-98.
5. Gupta RK, Bharti R, Shah MH, Pramanik K. Weed management in transplanted onion (*Allium cepa* L.) through early post-emergence herbicides. Plant Archives. 2020;20(2):6919-6924.
6. Kumar A, Manuja S, Singh J, Chaudhary DR. Integrated weed management in cauliflower (*Brassica oleracea* var. *botrytis*) under dry temperate climate of western Himalayas. Journal of Crop and Weed. 2015;11(2):168-171.
7. Kumar JS, Reddy KC, Rajkumar BV, Rao AM. Integrated weed management in cabbage. Annals of Plant and Soil Research. 2014;16(2):175-176.
8. Mani VS, Mala ML, Gautam KC, Bhagavandas. 1973. Weed Killing Chemicals in Potato Cultivation. Indian Farming. 23: 17-18.

Comment [GN8]: Please check the journal' format and change accordingly.

Formatted: Highlight

9. Patil AG, Patil SV, Farooq Md, Singh VP, Mangesh. Evaluation of different weed management practices on growth and yield of cabbage (*Brassica oleracea* var. *capitata*). The Pharma Innovation Journal. 2022;11(9): 2718-2722.
10. Sen S, Sharma RK, Kushwah SS, Dubey R. Effect of different weed management practices on growth and yield of cauliflower (*Brassica oleracea* var. *botrytis* L.). [Ann. Plant Soil Res.](#) 2018;20:63-68.
11. Singh M, Kaul A, Pandey V, Bimbraw AS. Weed Management in Vegetable Crops to Reduce the Yield Losses. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences. 2019;8(7):1241-1258.
12. Ustuner T, Sakran A, Almhemed K. Effect of herbicides on living organisms in the ecosystem and available alternative control methods. [Int. J. Sci. Res. Publ.](#) 2020;10:633-641.

Comment [GN9]: Expand

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [GN10]: Expand

Formatted: Highlight

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Treatments	Plant height (cm)			Number of unwrapped leaves	Fresh weight of heads (g)	Dry weight of unwrapped leaves (g)	Yield per hectare (q)
	30 DAT	60 DAT	At harvest				
T <sub>1</sub>	11.60	18.78	22.08	12.60	429.87	19.29	136.19
T <sub>2</sub>	11.03	18.38	21.79	12.27	376.62	18.93	117.17
T <sub>3</sub>	12.43	20.14	24.82	13.93	484.66	23.36	155.73
T <sub>4</sub>	12.90	19.86	24.41	13.40	470.06	22.74	148.84
T <sub>5</sub>	12.86	20.95	25.57	14.20	491.98	23.85	172.18
T <sub>6</sub>	13.16	21.92	26.23	14.87	499.34	24.82	174.73
T <sub>7</sub>	13.22	22.36	27.34	15.47	522.97	25.72	188.63
T <sub>8</sub>	10.58	16.75	18.82	10.27	287.55	15.76	71.23
SE(m) ±	0.71	0.85	0.89	0.66	18.03	0.90	5.51
CD at 5%	NS	2.62	2.81	2.02	55.22	2.76	16.88

Table 1. Effect of different weed management practices on growth and yield parameters in cabbage

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [GN11]: Several treatments were on par with T7. Please make the change in the text accordingly.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [GN12]: T5, T6 and T7 are on par. Please make the corresponding changes in the text.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [GN13]: Please check: several treatments are on par.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [GN15]: T2,T3, T5,T6 and T7 are on par. Please make the corresponding changes.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight


Comment [GN14]: Several treatments are on par with T7

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

**Table 2.**Effect of different weed management practices on weed parameters and economics in cabbage

UNDER PEER REVIEW



Data in parentheses indicates original values

Comment [GN16]:

Formatted: Highlight

Treatments	Weed count/0.25 m <sup>2</sup>			Dry weight of weeds (g/0.25m <sup>2</sup> )	WCE (%)	WI (%)	Net return (₹ /ha)	B: C ratio
	25 DAT	60 DAT	At harvest					
T <sub>1</sub>	3.25 (9.66)	3.59 (12.00)	4.78 (22.00)	8.81 (76.72)	56.14	27.94	108375	1.13
T <sub>2</sub>	1.98 (3.00)	3.44 (11.00)	5.19 (26.00)	9.25 (84.75)	51.56	37.95	81229	0.86
T <sub>3</sub>	1.71 (2.00)	2.88 (7.33)	3.95 (14.66)	5.12 (25.27)	85.64	17.37	137625	1.43
T <sub>4</sub>	1.82 (2.33)	2.99 (8.00)	4.35 (18.00)	6.06 (35.90)	79.61	21.03	139310	1.66
T <sub>5</sub>	1.82 (2.33)	2.06 (3.33)	3.55 (11.66)	4.53 (19.62)	88.83	8.73	167197	1.84
T <sub>6</sub>	1.60 (1.66)	1.90 (2.66)	3.20 (9.33)	3.84 (13.92)	92.15	7.06	157986	1.52
T <sub>7</sub>	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	100	0.00	154538	1.16
T <sub>8</sub>	3.64 (12.33)	5.16 (25.66)	6.80 (45.33)	13.29 (175.86)	0.00	62.48	27190	0.34
SE(m) ±	0.15	0.15	0.11	0.20	-	-	-	-
CD at 5%	0.46	0.48	0.34	0.63	-	-	-	-