Strategies and Technologies in Weed Management: A Comprehensive Review

Abstract

The global burden of weed infestations presents profound challenges for agricultural productivity, economic profitability, and environmental sustainability. This comprehensive review encapsulates a broad spectrum of weed management strategies, examining traditional practices and probing into the frontier of emerging technologies. The review begins by elucidating the historical context and significance of weed management, substantiated by a diverse range of scholarly works. We explore the complex nature of weeds, including their definitions, classifications, and the multifaceted impacts they exert on agriculture, ecosystems, and, where applicable, human health. Traditional weed management strategies, encompassing manual, cultural, biological, and chemical controls, are discussed with a balanced evaluation of their merits and demerits, supported by a wide array of research. The core of this review is an in-depth analysis of burgeoning technologies in weed management, comprising precision agriculture, genomic approaches, and robotic weed control, among others. We provide case studies highlighting the effectiveness of these innovations, while also addressing potential implementation challenges. Further, the review engages in an evaluation of the environmental and socioeconomic implications of both traditional and modern weed management strategies.
Discussion
around the environmental footprint of weed control, the economic benefits, potential downsides, and labor issues are corroborated by substantial literature. Recognizing the limitations of current strategies and the challenges posed by the implementation of nascent technologies, the review culminates in an exploration of prospective directions for weed management. Considering the continuous technological advancements, a future replete with precise, sustainable strategies, and the advent of smart systems, fortified by artificial intelligence and machine learning is anticipated. Moreover, the importance of fostering interdisciplinary collaborations and recommendation of the development of policies that incentivize the adoption of sustainable weed management practices are underestimated. This review, consequently, serves as a sound source for researchers, practitioners, and policy-makers in charting the course of new endeavors in weed management.

Keywords: *Agronomy, Herbicides, obotics, Genomics, Sustainability*

Introduction

Weeds have been a perennial challenge to agricultural productivity since the dawn of human civilization. The dawn of agriculture during the Neolithic era necessitated the management of undesired plant species that posed interference with crop production [1]. Archaeological findings suggesting the usage of sickle blades and hoes from this era are evidence that manual labour was employed for the task of weed control [2]. The first written record of weed control is found in an ancient Sumerian tablet from around 3,000 B.C., where a hoe was recommended as a tool for weed control [3]. The journey of weed management has travelled a long distance and has evolved over centuries. Romans noted the use of crop rotation to manage weeds [4] However, during the medieval era, water management practices were introduced to control weeds in rice paddies. The scientific understanding of weed biology and ecology, as well as the development of the first synthetic herbicides, occurred in the 19th century [5]. The real breakthrough in weed management came in the mid-20th century with the discovery of selective herbicides that could control weeds without causing harm to crops. This revolutionized agricultural productivity. The "green revolution" of the 1960s, which significantly increased crop yields globally, was made possible by these advances in weed management [6]. The significance of weed management is profound. Weeds compete with crops for resources such as sunlight, nutrients, and water, resulting in considerable reductions in crop yield [7].

A report [8] estimated global crop yield losses due to weeds at around 34%. In Australia alone, the economic cost of weeds in agriculture has been estimated to be AU$ 5 billion annually [9].

The impact of weeds extends beyond economics to the environment as well, leading to soil erosion and degradation, and reducing biodiversity by outcompeting native species. Some weeds also pose hazards to human and animal health. For example, ragweed (*Ambrosia artemisiifolia*) can trigger allergic reactions in human), while certain species of the Euphorbia genus produce a toxic latex that is harmful to animals. Traditional weed management strategies encompass mechanical, cultural, biological, and chemical control. Mechanical control involves the physical removal or destruction of weeds, either manually or by machinery.Cultural control modifies farming practices to give crops a competitive advantage over weeds, such as through crop rotation, altering planting density, or adjusting the timing of planting and harvesting. Biological control employs natural enemies of the weeds, such as insects, pathogens,, or other weeds, to control weed populations. In addition, chemical control deploys synthetic herbicides to kill, chemical control uses synthetic herbicides to kill or suppress weed growth [10]. In contrast, contemporary weed management strategies are more integrated and technology-driven. Integrated weed management (IWM) combines traditional strategies in an economically and environmentally sustainable way. Precision agriculture, leveraging GPS and remote sensing technology, applies herbicides only where needed, reducing costs and environmental impact [11]. Genomic approaches aim to develop crops that are resistant to weeds or herbicides, while robotic weed control utilizes autonomous machines to mechanically remove weeds. Weed management is a topic of great complexity, yet it is also a vital aspect of agriculture. The continuous struggle between humans and weeds, as well as the diverse strategies and technologies employed in this battle, have been subjects of numerous research studies and reviews.

Despite the vast knowledge in this respect, gaps yet exist in the literature. One such gap is the absence of comprehensive reviews that span the timeline from traditional to contemporary weed management strategies and technologies. Most reviews focus on either traditional or contemporary practices but seldom link the two in a comprehensive narrative.

In addition, with the rapid advancement in technology, particularly in areas such as robotics, precision agriculture, and genomics, it has become necessary to reassess and reframe our understanding of weed management strategies within the context of these advancements.

While individual studies, exploring these technologies are available, a comprehensive review that coordinates and evaluates these new developments in the broader context of weed management is really missing.

The purpose of this review, therefore, is to bridge these gaps.

This review aims producing a comprehensive overview of both the traditional and contemporary weed management strategies and technologies, highlighting their evolution, and appraising their advantages, limitations, and potential for future application.

Weeds

A universally accepted definition of a weed is elusive due to its subjective nature. Perhaps the most widely quoted definition is "a weed is a plant that grows where it is not wanted. This definition captures the essentially anthropocentric nature of the term -

a weed is a plant not because of any inherent properties, but because it interferes with human activities.

An ecological perspective defines a weed as a plant that colonizes disturbed habitats and is typically characterized by rapid growth and reproduction, high dispersal ability, and adaptability to a variety of conditions [12]. From an agricultural standpoint, weeds as "plants that threaten human welfare either by competing with crops, pastures, or forests, or by interfering with a human activity." Despite these varied definitions, the common thread that runs through all is that a weed is an undesirable plant in a given context. Weeds can be broadly classified into three major types based on their life cycle: annuals, biennials, and perennials. Annuals complete their life cycle

within one growing season and reproduce solely by seeds [13]. Common annual weeds include crabgrass (*Digitaria* spp.), lamb's quarters (*Chenopodium album*), and pigweed (*Amaranthus* spp.). Biennials require two years to complete their life cycle, growing vegetatively in the first year and flowering and producing seeds in the second year [14]. Examples of biennial weeds include wild carrot (*Daucus carota*) and bull thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*). Perennials live for more than two years and can reproduce vegetatively as well as by seeds, making them particularly difficult to control [15]. Dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale*), bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*), and Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*) are examples of perennial weeds. The impacts of weeds are vast and multifaceted, spanning economic, ecological, and health domains. Weeds pose a significant economic burden on agriculture through yield losses and control costs.
The global crop yield losses due to weeds was estimated to be around 34% (Table 1) [16].
In the US alone, the annual cost of weed management in major crops was estimated at $33 billion, with yield losses accounting for approximately $11 billion [17]. The ecological impact of weeds is also substantial. Invasive weeds can alter ecosystems by changing fire regimes, nutrient cycling, and hydrology, as well as outcompeting native species. For example, in the western US, the invasive annual grass Bromus tectorum (italicize pls) *Bromus tectorum*
has increased fire frequency, leading to a decline in native shrubs and changing the ecosystem from shrub-dominated to grass-dominated [18]. Certain weeds pose health hazards to humans and animals. For example, ragweed pollen is a major cause of hay fever and other allergic reactions in humans. Some weeds, such as poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans)* and stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*), cause skin irritations. Weeds can also be toxic to livestock, such as the poisonous jimsonweed (*Datura stramonium*).

Table 1: Percentage of Yield Reduction Caused by Weed in Different Crops

Name of crops	**% Yield reduction**	**Reference**
Direct seeded paddy	45-90	[19]
Transplanted paddy	15-38	[19]
Maize	28-93	[20], [19]
Sorghum	6-40	[19]
Finger millet	26-27	[21]
Redgram	20-47	[19]
Soybean	40-60	[22], [19]
Wheat	26 - 38	[23], [24], [25] and [26]
Oat	26-30	[26]
Lucerne	50-90	[27]
Barley	20-25	[26]
Chickpea	15-25	[26]
Lentil	20-30	[26]
Pea	20-30	[26]
Mustard	15-30	[26]
Linseed	30-40	[26]
Safflower	35-60	[26]
Groundnut	20 - 50	[27]
Sesame	50-75	[28]
Sunflower	30-64	[29]
Castor	15-25	[30]

Cotton	74-96.5	[31]
Niger	30-33	[32]
Jute	58-70	[33]
Coriander	20-50	[34]
Sugarcane	40-67	[35], [36]
Egyptian clover	30-40	[37]
Brinjal	49-90	[38], [39]
Tapioca	40-50	[40]

Traditional Weed Management Strategies

A. Manual Weed Control

Manual weed control, also known as mechanical weed control, involves physically removing weeds from the field by hand or with the aid of simple tools. This process could include hand-pulling, hoeing, ploughing, and mowing [41]. Manual control is one of the oldest forms of weed control, dating back to the beginnings of agriculture. The advantages of manual control are that it is simple, requires no specialized knowledge, is economical for small farms, and poses no risks to the environment or human health. It can be quite effective for perennial weeds, as it can disrupt their underground structures [42]. Manual control is labour-intensive, time-consuming, and often impractical for large-scale operations. It can also cause soil disturbance, leading to erosion and the exposure of more weed seeds in the soil seed bank [43]

B. Cultural Weed Control

Cultural weed control involves modifying the farming system to suppress weed growth and reduce their competitive ability. It includes practices such as crop rotation, intercropping, cover cropping, mulching, and adjusting planting times and densities [44]. The major advantage of cultural control is that it works within the farming system to manage weeds, reducing the need for external inputs. It can also enhance overall farm productivity and resilience by improving soil health and diversifying income sources [45]. The effectiveness of cultural control can vary depending on the specific farming system, weed species, and local conditions. Some practices may require additional labour or changes in farm management, which can be challenging for some farmers [46].

C. Biological Weed Control

A classic example of a successful weed control in Australia is the control of cactus (*Opuntia tomentosa* Salm-Dyck) by *Cactoplastis cactorum* (Berg.). Biological weed control involves using living organisms - often insects, mites, or pathogens - to suppress weed populations. These biological control agents are typically host-specific, targeting specific weed species [47]. Successful examples of biological control include the use of the cinnabar moth (*Tyria jacobaeae*) to control ragwort (*Senecio jacobaea*) in North America and the rust fungus *Puccinia chondrillina* to control skeleton weed (*Chondrilla juncea*) in Australia. The main advantage of biological control is that it can provide long-term, sustainable control with minimal environmental impact. Once established, the control agents can self-perpetuate and continue to suppress the weed population

[48]. Biological control has its limitations. It is generally slow to show results and may not be fully effective in all situations. There are also risks of non-target effects and the possibility of the control agent becoming invasive itself [49].

D. Chemical Weed Control

Chemical weed control involves the use of herbicides to kill or suppress weeds. Herbicides can be classified based on their mode of action, timing of application, or selectivity [50]. The main advantage of chemical control is its effectiveness and efficiency. Herbicides can control a wide range of weed species and are easy to apply, making them suitable for large-scale operations. The reliance on chemical control has led to several problems, including the development of herbicide-resistant weed populations [51]. Chemical control also poses environmental and health risks, such as the residues that include the contamination of water resources and potential impacts on non-target organisms and human health.

Emerging Technologies in Weed Management

A. Precision Agriculture

Precision agriculture is a farming management concept based on observing, measuring, and responding to inter and intra-field variability in crops. It involves the use of advanced technologies such as GPS, remote sensing, and on-the-go sensor technology to manage both spatial and temporal variability associated with all aspects of agricultural production, including weed management [52]. In the context of weed management, precision agriculture can involve site-specific weed management (SSWM) - where weed populations are mapped within fields and herbicides are applied only where needed [53]. This can significantly reduce herbicide use, thus decreasing costs and environmental impacts. Studies have shown the effectiveness of precision agriculture in weed management. A successful application of SSWM, which resulted in a 70% reduction in herbicide use with comparable yields.

B. Genomic Approaches

Genomics, the study of an organism's complete set of DNA, is increasingly being applied to weed science. Weed genomics can help to understand the genetic basis of traits that make some plants successful weeds, such as rapid growth, high fecundity, and herbicide resistance [54]. A case in point is the successful application of genomics in the management of the weed species *Amaranthus palmeri*. Researchers have sequenced its genome and identified genes responsible for herbicide resistance, potentially allowing for the development of more targeted control strategies [55].

C. Robotic Weed Control

Robotic weed control represents a significant advancement in the field of weed management. These systems utilize machine vision, artificial intelligence (AI), and precision application equipment to identify and remove weeds [56]. A case study illustrating this technology's success is the 'See & Spray' robotic system developed by Blue River Technology, which uses machine learning to distinguish between crops and weeds, applying herbicide only to the latter. This system has shown potential to significantly reduce herbicide use while maintaining high weed control efficacy [57].

D. Other Emerging Technologies

Other promising technologies in weed management include drone technology, which can be used for weed mapping and herbicide application and nanotechnology, which could offer new possibilities for herbicide formulation and delivery, thus reducing the volume of chemicals needed [58]. As these technologies continue to advance, they could significantly transform the future of weed management, making it more precise, efficient, and environmentally friendly. It will be crucial to address potential challenges, such as technology cost, user training, and regulatory issues, to facilitate their widespread adoption [59].

Environmental and Socioeconomic Implications of Weed Management

A. Environmental Impacts

Both traditional and modern weed management strategies pose environmental implications. A common traditional method, manual weeding, is labor-intensive but relatively environmentally benign, as it does not involve chemical inputs [60]. The frequent soil disturbance can contribute to erosion and loss of soil organic matter. Chemical weed control, another traditional method, involves the use of herbicides. While highly effective, these substances can contaminate water and soil and harm non-target organisms. Furthermore, herbicides contribute to the selection of resistant weed populations, posing a significant threat to agriculture and biodiversity. Biological weed control, which involves the use of organisms (e.g., insects, fungi) to suppress weeds, has less environmental impact than chemical control, as it is often specific to the target weed and does not pollute the environment [61]. Care must be taken to prevent unintended impacts on non-target species and ecosystems. Emerging technologies in weed management, such as precision agriculture and robotic weed control, offer environmentally friendly solutions. These technologies can significantly reduce herbicide use by targeting only weed-infested areas or individual weeds, respectively. The production, operation, and disposal of such technologies also entail environmental costs that should be considered [62].

B. Socioeconomic Impacts

Weed management has considerable economic implications. Successful weed control can significantly increase agricultural productivity, reducing the billion-dollar losses attributed to weeds annually [63]. Weed management also incurs costs, such as labor for manual weeding or expenses for herbicides and new technologies. The social aspects of weed management relate to its labor requirements and implications for rural livelihoods. For instance, manual weeding is a significant source of rural employment in many developing countries, particularly for women [64]. The shift towards mechanization and advanced technologies may reduce labor demand, potentially affecting rural economies and societies. Access to and adoption of advanced weed management technologies can be hindered by factors such as high costs, lack of skills, and inadequate institutional support, potentially widening the gap between well-resourced and less-resourced farmers. Efforts to foster equitable access to and benefit from these technologies will be critical to ensuring socially sustainable weed management.

Challenges and Future Directions in Weed Management

Even though traditional and emerging strategies for weed management have been successful to some extent, several limitations persist. Manual and cultural weed control methods are labor-intensive, time-consuming, and often inefficient on a large scale [65]. Biological control can be species-specific and slow to take effect. Chemical control, although effective, often has adverse environmental consequences, can promote herbicide-resistant weed biotypes, and can affect non-target organisms. Implementing emerging technologies such as precision agriculture, genomic approaches, and robotic weed control comes with its set of challenges. These include technological complexity, high upfront costs, need for skilled labor and expertise, data management, and compatibility with existing farm systems [66]. Also, the field-specific nature of these technologies requires customization, which may not be feasible for small-scale farmers or in developing countries. The future of weed management looks promising, due to advancements in technology. It will likely include more precise and sustainable strategies that can integrate several methods. Developments in areas such as machine learning and artificial intelligence could enable the creation of smart systems capable of detecting and responding to weed infestations in the optimum time, thereby optimizing the use of resources [67].
The deployment of genetically modified crops that can resist specific weeds could become a more prevalent solution. This, however, needs extensive thorough and more research.
Future research should focus on developing cost-effective, environmentally friendly, and socially sustainable weed management strategies that cater to the needs of diverse agricultural systems. The needs of diverse agricultural systems
should strive to understand the ecological dynamics of weed-crop interactions better, and apply these insights to design more sustainable and effective management approaches. There is also a need for increased interdisciplinary collaboration, with agronomists, ecologists, engineers, economists, and social scientists to design holistic solutions [68]. Finally, policies should incentivize the adoption of sustainable weed management practices and technologies, and ensure that these benefits are equitably distributed among farmers.

Conclusion

Weed management remains an ongoing challenge in global agriculture, with significant economic, environmental, and potentially health implications. While traditional strategies like manual, cultural, biological, and chemical controls continue to play vital roles, their limitations necessitate advancements in precision agriculture, genomic approaches, and robotic weed control. The application of these technologies brings its own complexities, calling for innovative solutions, interdisciplinary collaborations, and supportive policies. The future of weed management will likely be characterized by increased precision, sustainability, and the integration of smart systems. For holistic success, future research should endeavor to design cost-effective, environmentally friendly, and socially sustainable weed management strategies, backed by policy frameworks that foster equity and widespread adoption.

References:

1. Barman, K. K., Singh, V. P., Dubey, R. P., Singh, P. K., Dixit, A., & Sharma, A. R. (2014). Challenges and opportunities in weed management under a changing agricultural scenario. *Recent advances in weed management*, 365-390.

2. Soto-Gómez, D., & Pérez-Rodríguez, P. (2022). Sustainable agriculture through perennial grains: Wheat, rice, maize, and other species. A review. *Agriculture*, *Ecosystems & Environment*, *325*, 107747.

3. Lal, R. (2009). The plow and agricultural sustainability. *Journal of sustainable agriculture*, *33*(1), 66-84.

4. López- Granados, F. (2011). Weed detection for site- specific weed management: mapping and real- time approaches. *Weed Research*, *51*(1), 1-11.

5. van Lenteren, J. C., Bolckmans, K., Köhl, J., Ravensberg, W. J., & Urbaneja, A. (2018). Biological control using invertebrates and microorganisms: plenty of new opportunities. *BioControl*, *63*, 39-59.

6. Singh, R. B. (2000). Environmental consequences of agricultural development: a case study from the Green Revolution state of Haryana, India. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, *82*(1-3), 97-103.

7. Nath, C. P., Das, T. K., Rana, K. S., Bhattacharyya, R., Pathak, H., Paul, S., ... & Singh, S. B. (2017). Weed and nitrogen management effects on weed infestation and crop productivity of wheat–mungbean sequence in conventional and conservation tillage practices. *Agricultural Research*, *6*, 33-46.

8. Gianessi, L. P. (2013). The increasing importance of herbicides in worldwide crop production. *Pest management science*, *69*(10), 1099-1105.

9. Hoffmann, B. D., & Broadhurst, L. M. (2016). The economic cost of managing invasive species in Australia. *NeoBiota*, *31*, 1-18.

10. Weston, L. A. (1996). Utilization of allelopathy for weed management agroecosystems. *Agronomy journal*, *88*(6), 860-866.

11. Shaikh, T. A., Rasool, T., & Lone, F. R. (2022). Towards leveraging the role of machine learning and artificial intelligence in precision agriculture and smart farming. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, *198*, 107119.

12. Altieri, M. A. (1988). Ecological Approaches. *Weed Management in Agroecosystems. CRC Press, Boca Ratón, Florida*, 1-6.

13. Baskin, J. M., & Baskin, C. C. (1985). The annual dormancy cycle in buried weed seeds: a continuum. *BioScience*, *35*(8), 492-498.

14. Kelly, D. (1989). Demography of short-lived plants in chalk grassland. I. Life cycle variation in annuals and strict biennials. *The Journal of Ecology*, 747-769.

15. Major, J., & Pyott, W. T. (1966). Buried, viable seeds in two California bunchgrass sites and their bearing on the definition of a flora. *Vegetatio*, *13*(5), 253-282.

16. Gharde, Y., Singh, P. K., Dubey, R. P., & Gupta, P. K. (2018). Assessment of yield and economic losses in agriculture due to weeds in India. *Crop Protection*, *107*, 12-18.

17. Benbrook, C. M. (2012). Impacts of genetically engineered crops on pesticide use in the US--the first sixteen years. *Environmental Sciences Europe*, *24*(1), 1-13.

18. Chambers, J. C., Bradley, B. A., Brown, C. S., D'Antonio, C., Germino, M. J., Grace, J. B., ... & Pyke, D. A. (2014). Resilience to stress and disturbance, and resistance to Bromus tectorum L. invasion in cold desert shrublands of western North America. *Ecosystems*, *17*, 360-375.

19. Singh, R. 2014. Weed management in major kharif and rabi crops. *National Training on Advances in Weed Management*. pp. 31-40.

20. Malviya, A. and Singh, B. 2007. Weed dynamics, productivity and economics of maize as affected by integrated weed management under rainfed condition. *Indian J. Agronomy*. 52(4): 321-24.

21. Yadav, S., Mishra, S., & Pradhan, R. C. (2021). Ultrasound-assisted hydration of finger millet (Eleusine Coracana) and its effects on starch isolates and antinutrients. *Ultrasonics sonochemistry*, *73*, 105542.

22. Weed management by sowing methods and herbicides in soybean. *Indian J. Weed Science*. 45: 250-252.

23. Effect of soil solarization and crop husbandry practices on weed species competition and dynamics in soybean- wheat cropping system. *Indian J. Weed Science*. 40(1&2): 1-5.

24. Verma, S. K. and Singh, S. B. 2008. Enhancing of wheat production through appropriate agronomic management. Indian Farming. 58(5): 15-18.

25. Das, T. K., Tuti, M. D., Sharma, R., Paul, T. and Mirja, P. R. 2012. Weed management research in India: An overview. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 57(3 IAC Special Issue): 148-156.

26. Kewat, M. L. 2014. Improved weed management in Rabi crops. *National Training on Advances in Weed Management* pp. 22-25.

27. Sahoo, S. K., Pradhan, J., Kuruwanshi, V. B., Guhey, A., Rout, G. R., & Dash, R. (2017). Phytotoxic effect of pre-emergence herbicides on oil content and yield components of groundnut (*Arachis hypogeae*). *Int J Curr Microbiol App Sci*, *6*(9), 1738-1748.

28. Bhan, M., Bhadauria, U. P. S. and Sharma, S. 2012. Effect of varieties for weed and drought tolerance in different irrigation regimes. In: Proceeding of 3rd International Agronomy Congress, *IARI*, New Delhi, pp. 58-57.

29. Buratti, C., Barbanera, M., & Fantozzi, F. (2012). A comparison of the European renewable energy directive default emission values with actual values from operating biodiesel facilities for sunflower, rape and soya oil seeds in Italy. *Biomass and bioenergy*, *47*, 26-36.

30. Sankaranarayanan, S., & Srinivasan, K. (2015). Preparation of functionalized castor oil derivatives with tunable physical properties using heterogeneous acid and base catalysts. *RSC Advances*, *5*(62), 50289-50297.

31. Williams, M. M., Boydston, R. A., Peachey, R. E., & Robinson, D. (2011). Significance of atrazine as a tank-mix partner with tembotrione. *Weed Technology*, *25*(3), 299-302.

32. Olasantan, F. O. (1999). Effect of time of mulching on soil temperature and moisture regime and emergence, growth and yield of white yam in western Nigeria. *Soil and tillage research*, *50*(3-4), 215-221.

33. Babu, V. R., Sivakumar, G., Satpathy, S., & Gotyal, B. S. (2020). Isolation and characterization of baculoviruses from major lepidopteran insect pests infesting jute, Corchorus olitorius Linn. *J Entomol Zool Stud*, *8*, 122-126.

34. Yadav, S. S., Chaudhary, I., Yadav, R. L. and Heshwa, G. L. 2013. Growth and yield of coriander as influenced by weed management and nitrogen levels. *Indian J. Agronomy*. 58(4): 597-602.

35. Chauhan, R. S., & Srivastava, T. K. (2002). Influence of weed management practices on weed growth and yield of sugarcane. *Indian Journal of Weed Science*, *34*(3and4), 318-319.

36. Tomar, P. K., Prakash, O., & Singh, D. (2005). Weed management in late-planted sugarcane. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, *50*(4), 317-319.

37. El-Kramany, M. F., Elewa, T. A., & Bakry, A. B. (2012). Effect of mixture rates on forage mixture of Egyptian clover (Trifolium alexandrinum L.) with triticale (× Triticosecale Wittmack) under newly reclaimed sandy soil. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, *6*(5), 40-44.

38. Kamboj, S., Brar, K. S., & Gandhi, N. (2019). Effects of different sowing methods and weed management on yield of Brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) crop. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, *8*(4S), 39-41.

39. Banjare, K., Sharma, G., & Singh, A. P. (2014). Effect of weed management practices on crop growth and yield of winter season brinjal (Solanum melongena L.) under chhattisgarh plains. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Research*, *48*(5), 394-397.

40. Mani, M. (2017). Invasive insect pests and their management on tapioca (Manihot esculenta Crantz) in India. *Journal of Root Crops*, *43*(1), 58-65.

41. Van Der Weide, R., Bleeker, P. O., Achten, V. T. J. M., Lotz, L. A. P., Fogelberg, F., & Melander, B. (2008). Innovation in mechanical weed control in crop rows. *Weed research*, *48*(3), 215-224.

42. Bonus, H. (1986). The cooperative association as a business enterprise: a study in the economics of transactions. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics (JITE)/Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft*, 310-339.

43. Hoyle, G. L., Venn, S. E., Steadman, K. J., Good, R. B., McAuliffe, E. J., Williams, E. R., & Nicotra, A. B. (2013). Soil warming increases plant species richness but decreases germination from the alpine soil seed bank. *Global Change Biology*, *19*(5), 1549-1561.

44. Forte, C. T., Beutler, A. N., Galon, L., Castoldi, C. T., Winter, F. L., Holz, C. M., ... & Burg, G. M. (2018). Soil physical properties and grain yield influenced by cover crops and crop rotation. *American Journal of Plant Sciences*, *9*(04), 584.

45. Liebman. (2000). Integration of soil, crop and weed management in low- external- input farming systems. *Weed research*, *40*(1), 27-47.

46. Kilpatrick, S. (2000). Education and training: Impacts on farm management practice. *The journal of agricultural education and extension*, *7*(2), 105-116.

47. Fowler, S. V., Syrett, P., & Hill, R. L. (2000). Success and safety in the biological control of environmental weeds in New Zealand. *Austral Ecology*, *25*(5), 553-562.

48. Gupta, P., & Tamot, S. (2022). Exploiting the Attributes of Biocontrol Agent (Neochetina bruchi) as a Potential Ecosystem Engineer's. *Biodiversity of Ecosystems*, 199.

49. Suckling, D. M., & Sforza, R. F. H. (2014). What magnitude are observed non-target impacts from weed biocontrol?. *PloS one*, *9*(1), e84847.

50. Abubakar, Y., Tijjani, H., Egbuna, C., Adetunji, C. O., Kala, S., Kryeziu, T. L., ... & Patrick-Iwuanyanwu, K. C. (2020). Pesticides, history, and classification. In *Natural remedies for pest, disease and weed control* (pp. 29-42). Academic Press.

51. Walsh, M. J., & Powles, S. B. (2007). Management strategies for herbicide-resistant weed populations in Australian dryland crop production systems. *Weed Technology*, *21*(2), 332-338.

52. Tendulkar, A. (2021). Introduction to precision agriculture: Overview, concepts, world interest, policy, and economics. *Precision Agriculture Technologies for Food Security and Sustainability*, 1-22.

53. Lati, R. N., Rasmussen, J., Andujar, D., Dorado, J., Berge, T. W., Wellhausen, C., ... & Christensen, S. (2021). Site- specific weed management—constraints and opportunities for the weed research community: Insights from a workshop. *Weed Research*, *61*(3), 147-153.

54. Tranel, P. J., & Trucco, F. (2009). 21st- century weed science: A call for Amaranthus genomics. *Weedy and invasive plant genomics*, 53-81.

55. Ravet, K., Patterson, E. L., Krähmer, H., Hamouzová, K., Fan, L., Jasieniuk, M., ... & Gaines, T. A. (2018). The power and potential of genomics in weed biology and management. *Pest management science*, *74*(10), 2216-2225.

56. Gerhards, R., Andujar Sanchez, D., Hamouz, P., Peteinatos, G. G., Christensen, S., & Fernandez- Quintanilla, C. (2022). Advances in site- specific weed management in agriculture—A review. *Weed Research*, *62*(2), 123-133.

57. Zhang, J., Weaver, S. E., & Hamill, A. S. (2000). Risks and reliability of using herbicides at below-labeled rates. *Weed Technology*, *14*(1), 106-115.

58. John, K. N., Valentin, V., Abdullah, B., Bayat, M., Kargar, M. H., & Zargar, M. (2020). Weed mapping technologies in discerning and managing weed infestation levels of farming systems. *Research on Crops*, *21*(1), 93-98.

59. Neve, P., Vila- Aiub, M., & Roux, F. (2009). Evolutionary- thinking in agricultural weed management. *New Phytologist*, *184*(4), 783-793.

60. Soti, P., Goolsby, J. A., & Racelis, A. (2020). Agricultural and environmental weeds of south Texas and their management. *Subtropical Agriculture and Environments*, *71*.

61. Kennedy, A. C. (1999). Soil microorganisms for weed management. *Journal of Crop Production*, *2*(1), 123-138.

62. Robinson, B. H. (2009). E-waste: an assessment of global production and environmental impacts. *Science of the total environment*, *408*(2), 183-191.

63. Buhler, D. D. (2002). 50th Anniversary—Invited Article: Challenges and opportunities for integrated weed management. *Weed Science*, *50*(3), 273-280.

64. Gouse, M., Sengupta, D., Zambrano, P., & Zepeda, J. F. (2016). Genetically modified maize: less drudgery for her, more maize for him? Evidence from smallholder maize farmers in South Africa. *World Development*, *83*, 27-38.

65. Manning, S., & Miller, J. (2011). Manual, mechanical, and cultural control methods and tools. In *Invasive Plant Management Issues and Challenges in the United States: 2011 Overview* (pp. 231-244). American Chemical Society.

66. Bhowmik, P. C. (2003). Challenges and opportunities in implementing allelopathy for natural weed management. *Crop protection*, *22*(4), 661-671.

67. Misra, N. N., Dixit, Y., Al-Mallahi, A., Bhullar, M. S., Upadhyay, R., & Martynenko, A. (2020). IoT, big data, and artificial intelligence in agriculture and food industry. *IEEE Internet of things Journal*, *9*(9), 6305-6324.

68. Rosenfield, P. L. (1992). The potential of transdisciplinary research for sustaining and extending linkages between the health and social sciences. *Social science & medicine*, *35*(11), 1343-1357.