Original Research Article

Determination of crop-weed competition in summer pearlmiilet

Comment [a1]: Correct the spelling of pearl millet and change the title

ABSTRACT

The field experiment was conducted at Instructional farm of Department of Agronomy, Navsari Agriculture University, Navsari during summer season of 2021 to 2023 to study critical crop-weed competition in summer pearlmillet. There were 10 treatments comprising of initial weed free periods of 10, 20, 30 and 40 days after sowing (DAS) and weedy 10, 20, 30 and 40 DAS along with weedy till harvest (un-weeded check) and weed free till harvest (weed free check), were replicated thrice in the randomized block design. Results revealed that weed-free condition between 20 to 40 days after sowing (DAS) significantly increased the yield of pearl millet, whereas the lower yield was recorded when weeds were allowed to grow during this period. The maximum competition between crop and weed was between 20 to 40 DAS, which can be considered as critical period of crop-weed competition. To avoid the yield loss, weed management should be done in such a time so that minimum weed infestation is achieved in summer pearlmillet.

Comment [a2]: Add one point about economics

Key words: *Critical period; Crop-weed competition; Pearlmillet; Weed management.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Pearlmillet (*Pennisetum glaucum* L.) is one of the important cereal crops globally after rice, wheat and maize. It is a unique crop among the major cereals and the staple food and fodder crop of the world's poor and most food insecure populations in the arid and semi-arid tropics. In India, the area and production of pearlmillet during 2022-23 was 70.08 lac hectares and 95.31 lac tonne, respectively with productivity of 1360 kg/ha. In Gujarat, it is cultivated over an area of 2.03 lac hectares with a production and productivity of 3.63 lac tonnes and 1787 kg/ha, respectively [1]. Yield reduction was observed of pearlmillet 55% due to unrestricted weed growth Banga et al.,[2]. Therefore, effective weed control at the proper growth stage of the crop is one of the most important factors contributing to high yield. So the present experiment is proposed to study critical crop-weed competition in pearl millet.

Comment [a3]: Add more points in introduction. There are many previous works in pearl millet in weed mangement add those studies.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

An experiment was conducted at Instructional farm of Department of Agronomy, Navsari Agriculture University, Navsari in summer season of 2021 to 2023. The soil of the experimental field was clayey. There were 10 treatments comprising of initial weed free periods of 10, 20, 30 and 40 days after sowing (DAS) and weedy 10, 20, 30 and 40 DAS along with weedy till harvest (un-weeded check) and weed free till harvest (weed free check). To work out the weed count per unit area, a quadrant of size 0.5 x 0.5 m (count/0.25 m^2) was thrown randomly at one place in every plot and weeds were uprooted for population count at 10, 20, 30 and 40 DAS and at harvest and converted biomass g/1.0 m^2 and weed count as no/1.0 m^2 area. In weedy. check treatment, weeds were allowed to grow throughout crop growth period. The uprooted weeds were sun dried completely till reached to constant

Comment [a4]: Add field latlong of study

weight and eventually the dry weight was recorded for each treatment. The treatments laid out in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications.

The pearlmillet variety GHB 558 was sown with seed rate of 4.5 kg/ha in rows 45 cm apart. The crop was fertilized with 120 kg N and 60 kg P_2O_5 in the form of urea and DAP, respectively. Half of the N and full dose of P were applied at the time of sowing, while the remaining N was applied at 20 DAS. Complete weed removal was practiced through hand weeding in weed-free plots right from the germination. However, later weeds were hand pulled as and when emerged. In all other weed free treatments, viz. weed free up to 10, 20, 30, 40 DAS and up to harvest, the weeds were completely removed from the plot up to the respective days and after that the weeds were allowed to grow freely. In other treatments having certain weedy periods viz. weedy up to 10, 20, 30 ,40 DAS and up to harvest, the weeds were allowed to grow up to the respective days, thereafter, complete weed removal was practiced. Seed yield of each treatment was recorded and worked out as per cent of weed-free check.

Comment [a5]: Reason for taking this variety

Comment [a6]: Tell wheather the crop is grown as rainfed ot irrigaated condition. If irrigated, then add the days of irrigation

2.1 Weed control efficiency

The weed control efficiency was computed at different stages as well as at maturity using following formula suggested by Kondap and Upadhaya [3].

$$WCE\ \% = \frac{DWC - DWT}{DWC} X\ 100$$

Where,WCE= Weed control efficiency (%); DWC= Dry weight of weeds in control plots (weedy check); DWT= Dry weight of weeds in treated plot.

2.2 Weed index (%)

Weed index (WI) or weed competition index is defined as the reduction in yield due to presence of weeds in comparison to weed free plots. Weed index was worked out on the basis of formula suggested by Gill and Kumar [4].

$$WI\ \% = \frac{X - Y}{X} X\ 100$$

Where,X = Yield from weed free plot; Y = Yield from treated plot for which WI was worked out.

All the data obtained with reference to the weed count, weed biomass, crop growth and yield parameters were analyzed separately for each attribute according to the analysis of variance technique of Panse and Sukhatme [5].The critical differences were calculated to assess the significant differences between treatment means. The weed count and weed biomass data were transformed by $\sqrt{X}$ + 0.5for calculation of critical difference for significance.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Weed flora

The total number of weed species present in the experimental field was twenty under thirteen families and three categories – five monocot weeds, thirteen dicot weeds and one sedge. The species under monocot weeds category were: *Dinebra retroflexa, Echinochloa crusgalli* L. Beauv, *Sorghum halepense* L. Pers*., Digitaria sanguinalis* (L.) Scopand

Bracharia spp., dicot weeds were *Trianthema portulacastrum* L., *Portulaca oleraceae* L., *Euphorbia hirta* L., *Amaranthus viridis* L., *Amaranthus viridis* L., *Convolvulus arvensis* L., *Physalis minima* L., *Eclipta alba* Hassak., *Phyllanthus niruri* L., *Alternanthera sessilis* L., *Digera arvensis Forsk, Tridex procumbens* and *Vernonia cinerea* and those under sedge was *Cyperus rotundus* L. Species-wise data of weed composition revealed that *Dinebra retroflexa* among the monocot weeds and *Amaranthus viridis* L.among the dicot weeds were the most dominant at 40 DAS. The experimental field was mostly dominated by dicot weeds, which comprised of about 70% of the total weed population.

Comment [a7]: State the Reason

3.2 Effect on weeds

Table 1 shows that the weed count and dry matter accumulation decrease with the rise in weed free period from 10 to 40 DAS. With the advancement of crop growth stages after sowing there was considerable decrease in the weed population. At harvest the weed population reached to maximum 198/m^2 in weedy conditions (W_{10}) from 56.74/m^2 at 10 DAS. Weed free condition up to 40 DAS recorded significant reduction in weed population and weed dry matter accumulation compare to weedy condition throughout growth period. The maximum total weed dry biomass (2660 kg/ha) at harvest was recorded in weedy upto harvest treatment (W_{10}), whereas it was lowest in weedy up to 10 DAS (W_6, 105 kg/ha), this might be due to more accumulation of biomass in weed at harvest when the weed free period extended up to 20 DAS or longer, strong crop canopy cover suppressed new flushes of weed which emerged at subsequent crop stages thus the crop smothered the late emerging weed which resulted in significantly lower in weed population and dry matter accumulation under the weed free treatments. Ten days after sowing, weed count were in the range of 51.49 - 56.74 /m^2 with the dry biomass of 118 - 129 kg/ha, whereas at harvest the number of weeds increase to 198/m^2 in weedy throughout growth period with the weed dry biomass 2660 kg/ha. The findings are in conformity with those reported by Kiroriwal et al.,[6] and Patel [7].

3.3 Growth parameters

Acute weed infestation in the plot maintained weedy up to maturity, adversely affected the plant height of pearlmillet (Table 2). Keeping the crop free from weeds up to harvest or weedy up to 20 DAS and there after removal of weeds gave better plant height. At harvest, treatment W_5 (weed free up to harvest) shows higher plant height (169.19 cm) which was at par with W_6 treatment. Whereas, treatment W_{10} (Weedy up to harvest) recorded significantly lower plant height at harvest (148.29 cm). The higher values of plant height of this treatment might be due to better control of weeds throughout the crop growth period which might have better availability of moisture and nutrients to the crop resulting more favourable condition for crop, consequently crop attained more growth having smothering effect on weed.
The lowest value of growth attributes under weedy throughout growth period (W_{10}) might be due to severe competition by weed for resources which made the crop plant inefficient to take up moisture and nutrients consequently plant height, dry matter accumulation were adversely affected. These findings are in close conformity with those reported by Baldev et al., [8] and Dhage et al.,[9].

3.4 Yield attributes and yield

The weed competition adversely affected the yield attributing characters and seed yield of the pearlmillet. Weed is an important factor lowering yield of pearlmillet, which is responsiblefor reducing crop growth by two mechanisms. Primarily by competition for resources such as

Table 1. weed population and dry weight of weeds influenced by different treatments in summer pearl millet

Treatment	Weed population/m^2					Dry weight (kg/ha)			
	10 DAS	20 DAS	30 DAS	40 DAS	At harvest	20 DAS	40 DAS	At harvest	Total
W_1 : Weed free up to 10 DAS	0.71 (0.00)	5.41 (28.95)	8.02 (63.88)	9.03 (81.13)	10.62 (112.32)	7.43 (55)	18.16 (329)	25.54 (652)	34.31 (1177)
W_2 : Weed free up to 20 DAS	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	6.42 (40.72)	7.32 (53.13)	9.42 (88.35)	0.71 (0.00)	12.77 (162)	20.88 (436)	26.13 (682)
W_3 : Weed free up to 30 DAS	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	4.63 (20.94)	7.73 (59.30)	0.71 (0.00)	6.60 (43)	15.30 (234)	16.66 (277)
W_4 : Weed free up to 40 DAS	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	5.94 (34.85)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	10.80 (116)	10.80 (116)
W_5 : Weed free up to harvest	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)
W_6 : Weedy up to 10 DAS	7.23 (51.76)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	10.28 (105)
W_7 : Weedy up to 20 DAS	7.21 (51.49)	7.96 (62.91)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	10.89 (118)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	16.30 (266)
W_8 : Weedy up to 30 DAS	7.49 (55.56)	7.97 (63.01)	12.10 (145.95)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	10.90 (118)	0.71 (0.00)	0.71 (0.00)	24.14 (582)
W_9 : Weedy up to 40 DAS	7.51 (55.96)	8.23 (67.38)	12.30 (150.84)	12.96 (167.63)	0.71 (0.00)	11.26 (126)	29.30 (858)	0.71 (0.00)	38.32 (1468)
W_{10} : Weedy up to harvest	7.56 (56.74)	8.33 (68.94)	12.22 (148.95)	13.12 (171.58)	14.08 (198)	11.40 (129)	29.64 (878)	34.20 (1169)	51.58 (2660)
SE(d)	0.04	0.12	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.17	0.16	0.18	0.22
CD (P=0.05)	0.13	0.37	0.22	0.23	0.27	0.50	0.48	0.52	0.67
CV (%)	16.14	9.88	11.51	9.63	11.36	10.15	10.57	13.53	7.84

* = Actual value, ** = Transformed value ($\sqrt{X}$ + 0.5)

Table 2. Growth, yield attributes and yield as affected by different treatments in summer pearl millet

Treatment	Plant height at harvest (cm)	Number of ear head per m^2	Grain yield/ ear head (g)	Grain yield (kg/ha)	Straw yield (kg/ha)
W_1 : Weed free up to 10 DAS	150.30	67.15	4.50	2932	5090
W_2 : Weed free up to 20 DAS	151.41	67.74	4.58	3103	5423
W_3 : Weed free up to 30 DAS	155.37	73.58	4.66	3414	5960
W_4 : Weed free up to 40 DAS	165.91	80.85	4.80	3952	6847
W_5 : Weed free up to harvest	169.19	84.86	4.97	4162	7240
W_6 : Weedy up to 10 DAS	167.55	81.71	4.85	4024	7022
W_7 : Weedy up to 20 DAS	164.64	82.69	4.76	3900	6791
W_8 : Weedy up to 30 DAS	153.13	69.37	4.61	3183	5569
W_9 : Weedy up to 40 DAS	148.97	62.38	4.46	2717	4699
W_{10} : Weedy up to harvest	148.29	59.03	4.30	2438	4278
SE(d)	0.60	2.05	0.03	92.83	154.18
CD (P=0.05)	1.79	6.11	0.09	275.82	458.10
CV (%)	5.69	9.38	6.09	9.53	10.18

space, light, water, nutrients etc and by allellopathy, this involves releasing of toxin into the environment Bansal *et al*. [10]. Severe infestation of weed in the plots maintained weedy for initial 40 DAS and at harvest adversely affected the number of ear head per square meter compare to season long weed free condition (W_5) and weed free up to 40 DAS (W_4). Data presented in Table 2 showed lowest number of ear head/m^2 (59.03), grain yield/ear head (4.30 g), grain yield (2438 kg/ha) and straw yield (4278 kg/ha) in weedy throughout growth period (W_{10}). Maximum number of ear head/m^2, grain yield/ear head (g), grain yield (kg/ha) and straw yield (kg/ha) to the tune of 84.86, 4.97, 4162 and 7240 were recorded at weed free throughout growth period (W_5).The significantly higher grain yield (4162 kg/ha) and straw yield (7240 kg/ha) were obtained under treatment W_5 (weed free up to harvest) in pooled results and remained at par with treatments W_4, W_6 and W_7, however significantly lower grain yield (2438 kg/ha) and straw yield (4278 kg/ha) were recorded under treatmentW_{10} (weedy up to harvest). Figure 1 showed that keeping the crop weed free from 20 to 40 DAS increase the seed yield 3900 kg/ha to 4162 kg/ha as compared to the weedy throughout growth period, this shows that presence or absence of weed at any stage compete with the crop for nutrient, water and reduce the crop yield significantly. Analogous findings have been reported by Kiroriwal et al., [6]and Munde et al.,[11] The increase weed density and their biomass (Table 1) to such an extreme level under weedy check (W_{10}) might be attributed to uninterrupted growth of weed which ultimately suppressed the growth and yield attributing characters of pearlmillet.

3.5 Weed control efficiency (WCE)

Table 3 shows that weed control efficiency decreased from 96.05 % at weedy conditions up to 10 DAS (W_6) to 90.03, 78.10, 44.79 to 0.0 at weedy conditions up to 20 (W_7), 30 (W_8), 40 DAS (W_9) and throughout growth period (W_{10}), respectively. Weed control efficiency improved gradually with the increasing weed free period from 10 DAS to 40 DAS. Weed control efficiency improved from 55.77 % with the treatment weed free up to 10 DAS (W_1) to 100% with the treatment weed free throughout growth period (W_5). Higher weed control efficiency (100%) was observed in treatment W_5 (weed free up to harvest), which was followed by in the trend of W_6> W_4> W_7>W_3>W_8> W_2> W_1>W_9>W_{10}. Similar findings were also reported by Patel[7]and Das et al.,[12].

3.6 Weed index (%)

The data pertaining to weed index as influenced by different treatments are presented in Table 3. The different treatments exerted their effect on weed index. Increase of weed free period from 10 DAS (W_1) to 40 DAS (W_4) decreased the weed index gradually from 29.55 % to 5.06 and reached to zero in weed free conditions throughout growth period (W_5). Among the weedy treatments, weed index increased from 3.31 % to 34.72 % and maximum weed index 41.43 % was recorded in the treatment weedy up to harvest (W_{10}). The higher weed biomass resulted more weed index and lower weed biomass reduced the weed index. This shows that reduction in the yield of pearl millet was associated with presence or absence of weeds at different growth stages (Table 1 and 2). These findings are in agreement with the results reported by Singh et al.,[13]

3.7 Economics and critical period for weed-crop competition

The maximum gross returns (₹ 126686/ha) recorded by treatment W_5 where as maximum net returns (₹ 87126/ha) recorded by treatment W_6 and maximum B:C ratio (2.56) recorded by treatment W_7(Table 3). Weed free period beyond 20 DAS produced higher yield and net returns with positive B:C ratio. Weedy period beyond 30 DAS produced significantly lower seed yield with significantly lower net returns and B:C ratio as compare with weed free

period 40 DAS and above these result indicates that increase in pearl millet seed yield would be possible with increasing number of weed free days. Among the weedy treatments weedy up to 40 DAS results of significant reduction in seed yield of pearl millet along with lower net returns were obtained. Hence the present study suggested maintenance of weed free crop up to 40 DAS to achieve better yield as well as higher return. From the data in Table 3 it can be observed that reduction in seed yield of pearl millet was observed greater when weeding delayed from 20 to 40 DAS. These findings corroborate the reports of Deshveer and Deshveer [14], Patel [7] and Das *et al.* [12].



Fig.1. Pearl millet as influenced by various critical period of crop-weed competition treatments

Table 3. Economics of pearl millet as influenced by various critical period of crop-weed competition treatments

Treatment	Weed control efficiency (%)	Weed index (%)	Cost of cultivation (₹/ha)	Gross realization (₹/ha)	Net realization (₹/ha)	BCR
W_1:Weed free up to 10 DAS	55.77	29.55	29204	89184	59980	2.05
W_2:Weed free up to 20 DAS	74.35	25.46	31300	94591	63290	2.02
W_3:Weed free up to 30 DAS	89.58	17.99	33396	104031	70635	2.12
W_4:Weed free up to 40 DAS	95.64	5.06	35492	120121	84629	2.38
W_5:Weed free up to harvest	100.00	0.00	39684	126686	87002	2.19
W_6:Weedy up to 10 DAS	96.05	3.31	35492	122618	87126	2.45
W_7:Weedy up to 20 DAS	90.03	6.30	33396	118747	85351	2.56
W_8:Weedy up to 30 DAS	78.10	23.53	31300	97068	65768	2.10
W_9:Weedy up to 40 DAS	44.79	34.72	29204	82544	53339	1.83

4. CONCLUSION

On the basis of three year experiment, critical period for weed crop competition in pearlmillet range from 20 to 40 DAS after sowing. Taking into account the critical period for weed competition, one can go for any method of weed control which will be more effective under south Gujarat condition.

Comment [a8]: Add few more points in conclusion. Add some major weed control recommendations too rather than conclude it as general

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

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

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous (2023) APEDA 2023 report on country and state wise data during. https://apeda.gov.in/milletportal/files/Statewise_Millet_Production.pdf
2.Banga RS, Yadav A, Malik RK, Pahwa SK, Malik RS. Evaluation of tank mixture of acetachlore and atrazine or 2,4-D Na against weeds in pearlmillet. Indian J Weed Sci2002;32(3-4) : 194-198.
3.Kondap SM and Upadhyay UC. A Practical Manual of Weed Control. Oxford and IBH Publication, New Delhi:1985.
4.Gill GS, Kumar V. Weed index, a new method for reporting weed control trials. Indian J Agron.1969; 14(2): 96-98.
5.Panse VG,Sukhatme, PV. Statistical methods for Agriculture workers, Fourth Enlarged Edition, ICAR Publication,New Delhi;1985.
6.Kiroriwal A, Yadav, RS, Kumawat A. Weed management in pearlmillet based intercropping system. Indian J Weed Sci. 2012; 44 (3): 200–203.
7.Patel DM. Effect of spacing and herbicides application in summer pearlmillet [*Pennisetum glaucum* (L.) R. Br. emend. Stuntz]. M.Sc. Thesis submitted to S. K. Nagar, Dantiwada Agricultural University, Dantiwada ; 2012.
8.Baldev R, Chaudhary GR, Jat AS. Nutrient depletion by weeds, weed control efficiency and productivity of pearlmillet (*Pennisetum glaucam* L.) as influenced by intercropping systems and integrated weed management. Indian J Agri Sci. 2004; 74 (10): 534- 538.
9.Dhage VJ, Shete BT, Patil JB. Effect of integrated weed management on growth attributes of pearlmillet-pigeonpea intercropping system. Plant Physio. 2008; 22(2): 183-185.
10.Bansal GL, Nayyer H, Bedi YS. Allelopathic effect of *Eucalyptus macror* rhyncha and *E. youmanii* on seedling growth of wheat (*Triticuma estivum*) and radish (*Rapahnus sativus*). Indian J Agri Sci. 1992; 62(11): 771-772.
11.Munde SD, Patel JC, Ali S, Aghav VD. Weed control study in *kharif* pearlmillet (*Pennisetum glaucum* L.). Bioinfolet. 2013;10(2A): 464-468.
12.Das J, Patel BD, Patel VJ, Patel RB.Comparative efficacy of different herbicides in summer pearlmillet. Indian J Weed Sci. 2013; 45 (3): 217–218.
13.Singh RV, Kaushik MK, Singh, HR. Integrated weed management in pearlmillet under rainfed conditions of NWPZ of UP. Crop Res. 2006; 32 (1): 18-20.
14.Deshveer CL, Deshveer LS. Weed management in pearlmillet (*Pennisetum glaucam*) with special references to *Trianthem aportulacastrum*. Indian J Weed Sci. 2005; 37 (3- 4): 206-208.