

Original Research Article

EFFECT OF NON-CHEMICAL WEED MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON WEED DYNAMICS AND YIELD IN BLACKGRAM

ABSTRACT

The field experiment was conducted at [Research farm](#), Tamil Nadu Agricultural University during summer 2022 with ~~an the~~ objective of evaluating the non-chemical weed management practices in blackgram. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with ten treatments replicated thrice. Treatments include leaf extracts of sorghum, castor and papaya @ 30% concentration, citric acid 5% + garlic 0.2%, dust mulching, mechanical and hand weeding along with weed free, weedy and chemical checks. The results revealed that among ~~the various~~all the non-chemical weed management practices pre-emergence application of sorghum leaf extract @ 30% concentration resulted in lower weed density (56.33 ~~No.~~ m⁻²) and dry weight (3.28 g m⁻²) at 15 DAS giving a comparative yield of 875.0 kg ha⁻¹. ~~On at~~ 30 DAS dust mulching recorded lowest density (73.67 ~~No.~~ m⁻²) which was ~~on at~~ par with sorghum leaf extract (81.33 ~~No.~~ m⁻²) while weedy check recorded highest density (326.67 ~~No.~~ m⁻²). Thus, using 30% sorghum leaf extracts can aid in cost-effective non-chemical weed control in summer irrigated ~~Blackgram~~blackgram.

Key words: Blackgram; non-chemical; weed management; leaf extracts; pre-emergence; dust ~~mulching~~

Comment [DVG1]: write key words in ascending order

1. INTRODUCTION

Blackgram (*Vigna mungo* L.) a legume crop which belongs to the family leguminaceae. In India blackgram is the fourth important pulse crop after chickpea, pigeon pea and green gram. In India it is grown in 4.63 million ha area with 2.78 million tonnes production and 599 kg ha⁻¹ ([Indiastat, 2021-2022](#)) [1]. In India the productivity of blackgram is lower ~~as~~ compared to world average (1808 kg ha⁻¹). It is a short duration crop with an initial slow growth. Therefore, it experiences a severe weed infestation for 45 days after sowing. In both developed and developing countries weeds are the most important biotic constraints to crop production. Among ~~the~~ different biotic factors like weeds, insects, pathogens, nematodes, rodents and birds, *etc.*, weeds have highest potential for yield loss as they compete for sunlight, water, nutrient and space with crops apart from that they also act as host plants for insects and pathogens. Based on the nature and density of weed flora, the average yield loss reported was 30-50% [2]. Management of weeds during critical period of

Comment [DVG2]: please check the data

crop weed competition (15- 45 DAS) is very important to avoid severe yield loss. Use of herbicides for controlling weeds can be highly accepted by farmers for a rapid and effective weed control. But non-judicious use of herbicides set down negative impacts like herbicide resistant weeds. At present 266 weed species developed resistance against 164 herbicides in 96 crops [3]. Alternative weed management strategies have been investigated by researchers for years to achieve a cost- effective weed control strategies. There is a need of increased awareness within farmer's community, for an assured focus on the non-chemical methods for safe and successful weed control in agriculture. Hence, an attempt has been made to find the suitable, cost effective and efficient non-chemical weed management practices in blackgram.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted at [research farm of](#) Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore during summer 2022. The field is located at latitude of 11° 00'09.9" N, longitude of 76° 55'41.4" E and at an altitude of 429 m MSL. The field experiment was laid out in randomized block design with ten treatments and replicated thrice. The treatment details were mentioned in Table 1. The seeds are sown at 30 × 10 cm spacing [in a plot size of 21 m² \(7 × 3m\)](#) with VBN 11 blackgram variety.

Table 1. Treatment details

T ₁	PE Application-application of Sorghum-sorghum leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS
T ₂	PE Application-application of Caster-caster leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS
T ₃	PE Application-application of Papaya-papaya leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS
T ₄	PE Application-application of Citric-citric acid @ 5% + Garlic @ 0.2% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS
T ₅	Dust mulching* on 15 DAS and 30 DAS
T ₆	TNAU improved weeder on-at 15 DAS and 30 DAS
T ₇	Hand weeding twice on-at 15 DAS and 30 DAS
T ₈	PE application of Pendimethalin-pendimethalin @ 1.0 lit ha ⁻¹ on-at 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on-at 30 DAS (chemical check)
T ₉	Weed free check
T ₁₀	Weedy check

* Pulverizing the soil to create dust mulch

PE- Pre-emergence; DAS- Days after sowing; *fb*- followed by

2.1. PREPARATION OF EXTRACTS

2.1.1. PREPARATION OF LEAF EXTRACTS

The pest and disease-free leaves of sorghum, castor and papaya were collected in and around the experimental farm, of TNAU, Coimbatore. Collected leaves were washed and cut into small pieces and soaked in 1:1 ratio of water: leaves for overnight (12 h). Separately each species of soaked leaves with water were ground into paste and filtered through Whatman no.1 filter paper which makes stock solution. From the stock solution 30% concentration was prepared [4,5]

2.1.2. PREPARATION OF CITRIC ACID + GARLIC

Lemons were peeled off and juice was extracted and then filtered through muslin cloth and centrifuged for 15 min at 3,000 rpm. From the supernatant 5% citric acid were prepared [6]. Garlic cloves were ground and juice was homogenized in 100 ml of 0.9% cold salt solution at higher speed for 15 minutes. Homogenized mixture was filtered through muslin cloth and 0.2% solution was made from the stock [7] then 5% concentration of citric acid and 0.2% garlic extracts were mixed thoroughly [8].

2.2. WEED OBSERVATIONS

Weed count was taken by using 0.25 m² quadrant which is placed randomly in four places in the plot. The counted weeds were collected shade dried and oven dried for 72°C until the constant weight attained. The data obtained from weeds subjected to variations hence data were square root transformed $\sqrt{X + 0.5}$ before analysis statistically as per methods proposed by Gomez and Gomez [9].

2.2.1. WEED CONTROL EFFICIENCY (WCE)

Weed control efficiency was calculated using the weed density of each treatment at 15, 30 and 45 DAS by using the formula suggested by Mani *et al.* [10].

$$WCE (\%) = \frac{WD_c - WD_t}{WD_c} \times 100$$

WD_c - Weed density in unweeded control (No. m⁻²)

WD_t - Weed density in treated plot (No. m⁻²)

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1. WEED FLORA

The predominant weed species occurred in the experiment field is *Echinochola colona* in grasses, *Amaranthus retroflexus*, *Cleome viscosa*, *Convolvulus arvensis*, *Corchorus olitorius*, *Marsilea quadrifolia*, *Portulaca oleracea*, *Trianthema protulacastrum* in broad leaved weeds. Similar, weed flora was reported in blackgram at western zone of Tamil Nadu by Vikram *et al.* [11] and Richardsan *et al.*, [12].

Comment [DVG4]: check the spelling

Comment [DVG5]: italic

3.2. WEED DENSITY AND DRY WEIGHT

All the non-chemical weed management practices had significant influence on grass and broad-leaved weeds density (Table 2). In the experimental field, density of broad-leaved weeds was lower than density of grasses.

On At 15 DAS, chemical check recorded lower weed density (32 No. m⁻²) followed by sorghum leaf extract performed well with a weed density of 56.33 No m⁻² these results are fitted with the findings of Cheema *et al.* [13] who reported lower weed density was due to herbicidal effect and allelopathic effect of sorghum on the weeds. At 30 DAS chemical check (32.0 No. m⁻²) was on par with dust mulching (73.67 No. m⁻²) and hand weeding (78.33 No. m⁻²) followed by sorghum leaf extract (81.33 No. m⁻²). Highest weed density was recorded in weedy check (281.67 and 326.67 No. m⁻²) at 15 and 30 DAS respectively because no weed control measures were taken in weedy check. On 45 DAS, dust mulching recorded lower weed density (26.33 No m⁻²) due to repeated pulverizing of soil and the primary effect of dust mulching is controlling of weeds [15], while chemical check recorded lower weed dry weight (20.96 g m⁻²) which is on par with sorghum leaf extract (30.67 No. m⁻²). Among the treatments TNAU improved weeder recorded higher density (54.67 No. m⁻²) and weedy check recorded 153.67 No. m⁻² at 45 DAS.

Comment [DVG6]: delete from every where

The reduction in dry weight of weeds (Table 3) was highest in chemical check (2.11 g m⁻²) followed by sorghum leaf extract (3.28 g m⁻²) at 15 DAS, which was also reported by Yarnia *et al.* [14] were 5, 10, 15 and 20% sorghum extracts decreased the dry weight of *Amaranthus retroflexus* with 68.92, 85.87, 86.30 and 88.91%, respectively. At 30 DAS, chemical check recorded lowest weed dry weight (22.28 g m⁻²) which is on par with dust mulching (41.98 g m⁻²) and hand weeding (43.76 g m⁻²). Highest dry weight was recorded in weedy check (9.63 g m⁻² and 178.62 g m⁻²). The less minimum dry weight was observed in chemical check (20.96 g m⁻²) which is on par with dust mulching (24.46 g m⁻²) and sorghum leaf extract (26.30 g m⁻²) at 45 DAS.

3.3. WEED CONTROL EFFICIENCY

Weed control efficiency was calculated at 15, 30 and 45 DAS and presented in Table 4. Higher weed control efficiency was found in chemical check (88.58 % on 15 DAS and 79.13% on 30 DAS) followed by sorghum leaf extract (79.93%) on 15 DAS and dust

Formatted: Font: Italic

mulching (77.32 %) on 30 DAS. At 45 DAS TNAU improved weeder recorded lowest weed control efficiency (64.14%) because weeds present in intra rows were less affected by TNAU improved weeder.

3.4. YIELD

Highest seed yield was obtained in weed free check (983 kg ha⁻¹) followed by/b chemical check (896 kg ha⁻¹) due to less weed incidence, which offers less competition to utilize all the inputs to produce higher yield. Among the treatments 30% sorghum leaf extract (875 kg ha⁻¹) recorded higher yield which is on par with chemical check (Fig.1). Similarly, Safi *et al.*, [16] reported yield of sorghum leaf extract sprayed treatment (21.67 capsules plant⁻¹) is closely related with the herbicidal treatment (24.57 capsules plant⁻¹) in flax.

4. CONCLUSION

Among the treatments, sorghum leaf extract @ 30% as pre-emergence performed well in suppressing weeds at 15 DAS due to the presence of allelochemicals like sorgoleone, gallic acid, caffeic acids, protocateuic acid, p-hydroxybenzaldehyde, syringic acid, vanillic acid, p-hydroxybenzoic acid, p-coumaric acid, benzoic acid, ferulic acid and m-coumaric acid [17]. Though the treatments hand weeding and dust mulching were best on 15 DAS and 30 DAS, it involves more labour, hence it is uneconomical. From the experimental results, it could be concluded that the sorghum leaf extracts were effective in controlling weeds at earlier stages and further research in use of leaf extracts at different intervals can help in effective screening of leaf extracts for effective and efficient weed management.

Table 2. Effect of non-chemical weed management practices on weed density (No m⁻²)

Treatment	15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS
T ₁ - PE Application of Sorghum leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	7.53 (56.33)	9.04 (81.33)	5.57 (30.67)
T ₂ - PE Application of Castor leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	8.94 (79.67)	10.49 (109.67)	5.84 (33.67)
T ₃ - PE Application of Papaya leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	8.14 (66)	9.8 (95.67)	5.7 (32)
T ₄ - PE Application of Citric acid @ 5% + Garlic @ 0.2% on 3DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	9 (80.67)	10.74 (115)	5.9 (34.33)
T ₅ -Dust mulching on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	16.19 (261.67)	8.61 (73.67)	5.17 (26.33)
T ₆ - TNAU improved weeder on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	16.25 (263.67)	9.62 (92.33)	7.43 (54.67)
T ₇ - Hand weeding twice on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	16.31 (265.67)	8.87 (78.33)	6.03 (36)

Formatted: Font: Italic

Comment [DVG7]: delete from every place

T ₈ - PE application of Pendimethalin @ 1.0 lit ha ⁻¹ on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS (chemical check)	5.69 (32)	8.22 (67.33)	5.27 (27.33)
T ₉ - Weed free check	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)
T ₁₀ - Weedy check	16.79 (281.67)	18.08 (326.67)	12.4 (153.67)
SEd	0.38	0.38	0.32
CD (P=0.05)	0.80	0.80	0.67

Comment [DVG8]: three decimals

Comment [DVG9]: write in three digits

PE- Pre- emergence; DAS- Days After Sowing; *fb*- followed by

Data present in the table is square root transformed value and parentheses are original value.

Table 3. Effect of non-chemical weed management practices on weed dry weight (g m⁻²)

Treatment	15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS
T ₁ - PE Application of Sorghum leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	1.94 (3.28)	7.55 (56.81)	5.14 (26.30)
T ₂ - PE Application of Castor leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	2.32 (4.92)	8.41 (70.27)	5.75 (32.70)
T ₃ - PE Application of Papaya leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	2.3 (4.83)	7.98 (63.43)	5.83 (33.62)
T ₄ - PE Application of Citric acid @ 5% + Garlic @ 0.2% on 3DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	2.46 (5.56)	8.65 (74.74)	5.82 (33.65)
T ₅ - Dust mulching on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	3.09 (9.08)	6.51 (41.95)	4.99 (24.46)
T ₆ - TNAU improved weeder on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	3.16 (9.47)	7.12 (50.39)	6.78 (45.53)
T ₇ - Hand weeding twice on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	3.13 (9.32)	6.65 (43.76)	5.48 (29.61)
T ₈ - PE application of Pendimethalin @ 1.0 lit ha ⁻¹ on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS (chemical check)	1.62 (2.11)	4.77 (22.28)	4.62 (20.96)
T ₉ - Weed free check	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)	0.71 (0)
T ₁₀ - Weedy check	3.18 (9.63)	13.37 (178.62)	14.51 (210.75)
SEd	0.10	0.41	0.39
CD (P=0.05)	0.21	0.87	0.82

PE- Pre- emergence; DAS – Days After sowing; *fb*- followed by

Data present in the table is square root transformed value and parentheses are original value.




Fig 1. Effect of non-chemical weed management practices on grain yield (kg ha⁻¹)

Table 4. Effect of non-chemical weed management practices on weed control efficiency (%) in blackgram

Treatment	15 DAS	30 DAS	45 DAS
T ₁ - PE Application of Sorghum leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	79.93	75.05	79.79
T ₂ - PE Application of Castor leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	71.68	66.13	77.86
T ₃ - PE Application of Papaya leaf extract @ 30% on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	76.56	70.54	78.88
T ₄ - PE Application of Citric acid @ 5% + Garlic @ 0.2% on 3DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS	71.39	64.64	77.42
T ₅ - Dust mulching on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	6.94	77.32	82.66
T ₆ - TNAU improved weeder on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	6.39	71.42	64.14
T ₇ - Hand weeding twice on 15 DAS and 30 DAS	5.72	76.02	76.14
T ₈ - PE application of Pendimethalin @ 1.0 lit ha ⁻¹ on 3 DAS <i>fb</i> hand weeding on 30 DAS (chemical check)	88.58	79.13	82.00
T ₉ - Weed free check	100.00	100.00	100.00
T ₁₀ -Weedy check	0.00	0.00	0.00

PE- Pre- Emergence application; DAS- Days after sowing; *fb*- followed by



Fig 2. Preparation of leaf extracts



Fig 3. T₁ - PE Application of Sorghum leaf extract @ 30%



Fig 4. T₁₀ -Weedy check



Fig 5. T₇- Hand weeding twice on 15 DAS and 30 DAS

REFERENCE

1. Indiastat; 2021- 2022. Available at <https://www.indiastat.com/table/agriculture/selected-state-season-wise-area-production-product/1440321>
2. Mishra JS. Critical period of weed competition and losses due to weeds in major field crops. *Farmers and parliament*.1997; 33(6); 19-20.
3. Heap I. The International Herbicide-Resistant Weed Database. Available online: www.weedscience.org (accessed on 20 February 2022)
4. Ramachandran A. Efficacy of different botanical extracts on the management of *Parthenium hysterophorus* (L.). *Journal of Research in Weed Science*. 2019;2(1):16-32.
5. Varshini PA, Arthanari PM, Kumar GS, Bharathi C. Screening of Effective Leaf Extracts for Weed Management in Little Millet (*Panicum sumatrense* Roth ex Roem. & Schult). *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*. 2022;34(21):552-9.
6. Rasul Suleria HA, Sadiq Butt M, Muhammad Anjum F, Saeed F, Batool R, Nisar Ahmad A. Aqueous garlic extract and its phytochemical profile; special reference to antioxidant status. *International Journal of Food Sciences and Nutrition*. 2012; 63(4):431-9.
7. Chanukya BS, Prakash M, Rastogi NK. Extraction of citric acid from fruit juices using supported liquid membrane. *Journal of Food Processing and Preservation*. 2017; 41(1); e12790.
8. Abouziena HF, Omar AA, Sharma SD, Singh M. Efficacy comparison of some new natural-product herbicides for weed control at two growth stages. *Weed Technology*. 2009; 23(3); 431-7.
9. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. *Statistical procedures for agricultural research*: John Wiley and Sons; 1984.

Comment [DVG10]: write alphabetical, name of journal in italic and vol no bold

10. Mani VS, Mala ML, Gautam KC, Bhagavandas. Losses in crop yield in India due to weed growth. *Pans (C)* 1973; 14142-158.
11. Vikram K, Chinnamuthu C, Marimuthu S, Bharathi C. Synthesizing Nanoencapsulated Sulfentrazone Herbicide and Optimizing Time and Dose for Season Long Weed Management in Irrigated Blackgram (*Vigna mungo* L.). *Legume Research- An International Journal*.2021; 4447;1- 8.
12. Richardsan AS, Bharathi C, Janaki P, Kalaiselvi T, Arthanari PM. Effect of Weed Management Practices and Bio-fertilizers with and without FYM on Weed Flora, Growth and Yield of Blackgram (*Vigna mungo* L.). 2022. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*; 34(22); 37-48.
13. Cheema Z A, Khaliq A. Use of sorghum allelopathic properties to control weeds in irrigated wheat in a semi-arid region of Punjab. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*. 2000; 79(2-3); 105-112
14. Yarnia M, Benam MK, Tabrizi, EFM. Allelopathic effects of sorghum extracts on *Amaranthus retroflexus* seed germination and growth. *Journal of Food, Agriculture & Environment*. 2009; 7(4); 770-774.
15. Rowe-Dutton P. The mulching of vegetables. *Soil science*.1958; 85(4); 233.
16. Safi SM, Hammood WF, Al-khaldy RA. Evaluation of the effectiveness of sorghum leaf extract and herbicide in controlling flax weeds. *Int. J. Agricult. Stat. Sci.* 2020;16(Supplement 1);1559-63.
17. Weston LA. Utilization of allelopathy for weed management in agroecosystems. *Agronomy journal*. 1996; 88(6); 860-6.