Original Research Article
Herbicidal and nitrogen efficacy on weed management in wheat fields of Eastern Uttar Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Weeds can significantly affect crop yield and nutrient uptake, making effective management crucial in wheat fields. This study, conducted during the winter (Rabi) season of 2018-19 at the Agricultural Research Farm of Banaras Hindu University in Varanasi, aimed to assess the combined impact of different nitrogen levels and herbicide treatments on weed control and wheat production. The objective was to determine the best practices for reducing weed competition and improving crop performance.The experiment was set up using a split plot design with three replications.The treatments comprised of 3 nitrogen levels and 5 weed control methods. The study identified nine prevalent weed species in wheat fields, including *Phalaris minor, Anagallis arvensis, Cynodondactylon, Chenopodium album,Melilotus indicus, Vicia sativa, Medicago denticulata, Solanum nigrum, and Cyperusrotundus*, with *Anagallis arvensis, Chenopodium album* and*Vicia sativa* being the most dominant. The application of Sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) combined with 2, 4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}) resulted in the lowest weed density and biomass and the highest weed control efficiency. Additionally, performing hand weeding twice (30 and 60 days after sowing) in conjunction with 180 kg N ha^{-1}, followed by the application of Sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) + 2, 4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), significantly reduced *Anagallis arvensis, Chenopodium album* and*Vicia sativa* population and biomass and improved weed control effectiveness. Higher weed dryweight and population results in lower plant nutrient uptake and lower dry matter of crop plant and yield.

Keywords: Nitrogen levels; sulfosulfuron; 2, 4-DEE; weeds; wheat.

1. INTRODUCTION

Weeds represent a significant biotic challenge to achieving optimal wheat yields and are often the primary factor contributing to the high cost of production. This challenge exacerbates issues of poverty and food insecurity. Effective weed management, whether targeting grassy or broad-leaved species, necessitates a comprehensive approach that integrates both chemical and non-chemical control strategies [1]. Addressing complex weed populations requires the use of multiple herbicides in combination. This practice not only improves the control of resistant weed species but also helps in delaying the development of herbicide resistance [2]. Research indicates that broad-leaved and grassy weeds can reduce wheat grain yields by as much as 52.2% and 55.7%, respectively [3]. Additionally, [4] reported a 47.5% decrease in wheat grain production in plots with unmanaged weed infestations compared to other treatment options.

The management of diverse weed populations requires the application of several herbicides, as this approach enhances the effectiveness of weed control and postpones the onset of herbicide resistance [5]. Furthermore, [6] demonstrated that increasing nitrogen levels from 0 to 45 kg ha^{-1}, 45 to 90 kg ha^{-1}, and 90 to 135 kg ha^{-1} resulted in increased nitrogen uptake by 28.20%, 14.90%, and 7.70%, respectively, and phosphorus uptake by 26.20%, 13.60%, and 8.50% over previous levels. It was observed that both the quantity and timing of input applications significantly influenced weed presence and density in the field. Enhancing nitrogen fertilization from 120 to 150 kg N ha^{-1} improved grain and straw yields by promoting greater dry matter accumulation, increasing tiller numbers, and boosting nutrient uptake [7,19]. This research aims to clarify the interplay between nitrogen levels, herbicide application, and weed management to provide valuable insights for optimizing wheat production and mitigating the negative impacts of weed infestations.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The fieldwork was carried out at the Agricultural Research Farm of Banaras Hindu University in Varanasi during the winter (rabi) season of 2018–19. The farm is situated in the subtropical Indo-

Gangetic Plains at a latitude of 25° 18' North and a longitude of 83° 03' East, on the left bank of the River Ganga, at an elevation of 75.70 meters above sea level. The soil at the site is sandy clay loam with a pH of 7. It has low organic carbon content (0.21%), available nitrogen (152 kg ha^{-1}), medium phosphorus (23.5 kg ha^{-1}), and readily available potassium (188 kg ha^{-1}). The experimental design employed was a split plot arrangement with three replications.

The treatments comprised of 3 nitrogen levels and 5 weed control methods, *viz.*, nitrogen levels: 120 kg ha^{-1}, 150 kg ha^{-1}, 180 kg ha^{-1}, weed control treatments: Weedy check, Hand weeding at 30 DAS and 60 DAS, Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml a.i ha^{-1}) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml a.i ha^{-1}), Pendimethalin 30% EC at 1000 ml a.i ha^{-1} and 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml a.i ha^{-1} at 30-35 DAS), Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g a.i ha^{-1})+ 2,4-DEE 38% EC at 750 ml a.i ha^{-1}. On December 9th, 2018, 100 kg ha^{-1} of the wheat variety "HD-2967" were sowed, and irrigation was given during crucial crop growth phases. At rates of 60 kg ha^{-1} for single super phosphate (SSP) and 60 kg ha^{-1} for muriate of potash (MOP), respectively, the necessary doses of phosphorous and potassium were applied. Urea is used to apply nitrogen in accordance with the therapy. The remaining half of the nitrogen was administered as a top-dressing in two equal portions after the first and second irrigations, along with the full doses of phosphorus, potassium, and the remaining half of the nitrogen at the time of sowing. In terms of weed population, weed dry matter buildup, nutritional content, depletion (N, P, and K), and efficiency of various treatments. Each plot had a 25 × 25 cm quadrant where weeds were gathered at random and sun-dried. Samples were dried in an electric oven at a temperature of 60 to 65°C for 48 hours after being exposed to the sun. The dry weight resulting from this process was given in g m^{-2}. At 15, 30, 60, and 90 days after treatment application (DAA), weed dry weight, weed control effectiveness, and weed population (pre-treatment) were all recorded. After 90 DAA, nutrient content and weed depletion of it were recorded. Data related to weed components were analyzed using various statistical methods and square root transformation ($\sqrt{x+0.5}$) was undergone for uniformity.

Weed control efficiency: Weed control efficiency (W.C.E.) can be calculated on the basis of dates of observation by using the formula suggested by [9].

Weed control efficiency = [(DWC – DWT)÷DWC]×100

Where DWC = dry weight of weeds in control (unweeded) plot

DWT = dry weight of weeds in the treated plot

Statistical analysis: The distribution of the data on weeds was normalized using the square-root transformation and all data were statistically analyzed using ANOVA (Gomez and Gomez, 1984). A critical difference at P<0.05was used to differentiate treatment means

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Weed flora

During the field investigation, several common weed species were identified in the experimental field, including *Phalaris minor, Cynodondactylon*, and various broad-leaved weeds such as *Medicago denticulata, Anagallis arvensis, Melilotus indicus, Vicia sativa, Chenopodium album, and Solanum nigrum*, with *Cyperusrotundus* being the only sedge present. The study explored the impact of nitrogen levels and pesticides on prominent weeds like*Anagallis arvensis*, *Chenopodium album* and *Vicia sativa* were examined how these factors influence its growth characteristics.

3.2. Herbicides and nitrogen levels on weed density and weed dry weight

A detailed analysis of the data showed that both the population and dry weight of *Anagallis arvensis* were significantly affected by the various treatments, as outlined in Tables 2 and 5. At 15 days after application (DAA), the highest efficiency was achieved with the twice application of hand weeding (30 and 60 days after sowing) and the herbicide combination of Pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) followed by 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), which resulted in the lowest weed density and dry weight. This treatment was significantly more effective than the weedy check and comparable to other herbicidal treatments. At 30 and 60 DAA, the combination of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}) demonstrated a significant reduction in both the density and dry weight of *Anagallis arvensis* compared to the weedy check, although it was statistically similar to other herbicide treatments. By 90 DAA, the sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}) combination, as well as Pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) followed by 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), significantly reduced the density of *Anagallis arvensis* compared to the weedy check, but were statistically similar to other herbicidal treatments. Throughout all observation periods, variations in nitrogen application levels did not significantly affect weed density and dry weight. Additionally, the data analysis revealed that the population of *Chenopodium album* was also significantly influenced by the different treatments, as detailed in Tables 1 and 4. Application of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) + 2, 4-DEE (750 ml ha^{-1}) significantly exhibited lower density of *Chenopodium album* over the weedy check but it was statistically at par with the other herbicidal treatments except at 15 DAA where, HW twice (30&60 DAS) plot followed by pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) *fb* 2, 4-DEE (750 ml ha^{-1}) significantly superior over the weedy check and statistically at par with rest of the herbicidal treatments. A thorough analysis of the data indicated that, at all observation dates, there were no significant differences in weed density and dry weight across the various nitrogen application levels, with the exception of 60 days after application (DAA). At this time, the application of 120 kg N ha^{-1} resulted in the highest density of *Chenopodium album*.These results were in close conformity with the findings reported by [12], [14] and [15].

A critical analysis of the data showed that the population of *Vicia sativa* was significantly affected by the various treatments, as detailed in Tables 3 and 5. The lowest weed density was observed with the application of pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) followed by 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), compared to the weedy check. However, this treatment was statistically similar to other herbicidal treatments, except at 60 days after application (DAA), where the combination of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}) significantly reduced both the density and dry weight of *Vicia sativa* compared to the weedy check, though it was still comparable to other herbicide treatments. The effectiveness of weed control, as indicated by these data, was positively correlated with crop yield. Detailed data on weed control efficiency for the various treatments are presented in Tables 7-9. These results are consistent with the findings reported by [8] and [16].

3.3. Weed control efficiency of different herbicide combinations and nitrogen levels on weeds

A detailed analysis of the data, as shown in Table 8, revealed that the weed control efficiency (WCE) for *Anagallis arvensis* varied with different treatments. At 15 days after application (DAA), the highest WCE was achieved with the combination of Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml ha^{-1}) followed by 2,4-D 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1}). At 30 DAA, the highest WCE was again observed with Pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) followed by 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), while the lowest WCE was recorded with the combination of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}). By 60 and 90 DAA, the highest WCE was noted with the application of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), whereas the lowest WCE was observed with Pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) followed by 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}). These results align closely with the findings of [14], [15], and [17].

A detailed examination of the data showed varying weed control efficiencies (WCE) across different nitrogen application levels. At 15 days after application (DAA), the highest WCE was observed with the application of 150 kg N ha^{-1}. During 30 and 90 DAA, the highest WCE was achieved with 120 kg N ha^{-1}, while at 60 DAA, the greatest WCE was noted with 180 kg N ha^{-1}.The WCE of *Chenopodium album* was significantly affected by different treatments, as detailed in Table 7. At 15 DAA, the highest WCE was recorded with Pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) followed by 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), whereas the lowest WCE was observed with the twice hand weeding treatment (30 and 60 DAS). At 30, 60, and 90 DAA, the highest WCE was achieved with the combination of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), followed by Pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}). The lowest WCE during these periods was noted with the twice hand weeding treatment.For *Vicia sativa*, the WCE was also influenced by various treatments, as shown in Table 9. At both 15 and 30 DAA, the highest WCE was achieved with Pendimethalin (1000 ml ha^{-1}) followed by 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), with hand weeding twice (30 and 60 DAS) and the combination of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}) also showing high WCE. The lowest WCE was recorded with Pinoxaden (40 ml ha^{-1}) combined with 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}). These findings are consistent with those reported by [9], [10], and [11].

The highest weed control efficiency was observed with the combination of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}), followed by Pinoxaden (40 ml ha^{-1}) combined with 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}). The lowest weed control efficiency was noted with the twice hand weeding treatment (30 and 60 DAS). Analysis of the data showed that the application of 120 kg N ha^{-1} resulted in higher weed control efficiency at 15, 30, and 90 days after application (DAA), while the highest weed control efficiency at 60 DAA was achieved with 150 kg N ha^{-1}. These results align with the findings of [12], [13], and [18]. Additionally, [6] found that increasing nitrogen levels from 0 to 45 kg ha^{-1}, from 45 to 90 kg ha^{-1}, and from 90 to 135 kg ha^{-1} resulted in increases in nitrogen uptake by 28.20%, 14.90%, and 7.70%, respectively, and phosphorus uptake by 26.20%, 13.60%, and 8.50% over the previous levels. The study also highlighted that both the quantity and timing of inputs significantly influenced weed presence and density. Enhanced nitrogen fertilization from 120 to 150 kg N ha^{-1} improved grain production and straw yield by increasing dry matter accumulation, the number of tillers, and nutrient uptake.

Table 1. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels on density (No. m^{-2}) of *Chenopodium album* in wheat

Treatments	Weed density (No. m^{-2})				
	Pre-treatment	15 DAA	30 DAA	60 DAA	90 DAA
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})					
120	2.94 (8.67)	2.26 (4.67)	2.27 (4.67)	1.87 (3.00)	2.04 (3.67)
150	3.18 (9.67)	2.67 (6.67)	1.72 (3.00)	1.76 (2.67)	1.95 (3.33)
180	2.67 (6.67)	2.48 (5.67)	2.34 (5.00)	1.68 (2.33)	1.95 (3.33)
SEm ±	0.262	0.212	0.08	0.042	0.065
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	0.165	NS
Herbicides					
Weedy check	3.37 (11.00)	3.53 (12.00)	3.80 (14.00)	2.76 (7.67)	2.80 (7.67)
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	2.97 (8.33)	1.72 (2.67)	1.87 (3.00)	1.50 (2.00)	2.05 (3.78)
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	2.60 (6.33)	2.12 (4.00)	1.48 (1.67)	1.77 (3.00)	1.73 (2.89)
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	2.67 (6.67)	1.76 (2.67)	1.35 (1.67)	1.41 (1.67)	1.40 (1.78)
Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	3.18 (9.67)	2.57 (7.00)	1.22 (1.00)	1.10 (1.00)	1.22 (1.00)
SEm ±	0.205	0.14	0.23	0.176	0.203
CD (P=0.05)	0.598	0.40	0.68	0.513	0.594

*Ethyl ester, DAA= Days after treatment application, NS= Non-significant

Data subjected to square root ($\sqrt{x}$ + 0.5) transformation and original data presented in parenthesis

Table 2. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels on density (No. m^{-2}) of *Anagallis arvensis*in wheat

Treatments	Weed density (No. m^{-2})				
	Pre-treatment	15 DAA	30 DAA	60 DAA	90 DAA
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})					
120	2.39 (5.67)	2.48 (5.67)	1.92 (3.67)	1.80 (3.33)	1.71 (2.67)
150	2.34 (5.33)	2.85 (7.67)	2.12 (4.00)	1.92 (3.67)	1.95 (3.33)

180	2.39 (5.67)	2.57 (6.00)	2.20 (4.33)	2.12 (4.00)	1.95 (3.33)
SEm ±	0.73	0.07	0.43	0.08	0.15
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Herbicides					
Weedy check	2.19 (4.33)	3.48 (11.67)	3.53 (12.00)	3.08 (9.00)	3.01 (8.67)
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	2.12 (4.00)	1.63 (2.33)	1.78 (2.67)	1.71 (2.67)	2.04 (3.67)
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	2.19 (4.33)	2.89 (8.33)	1.95 (3.33)	1.76 (2.67)	1.47 (1.67)
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	2.19 (4.33)	2.19 (4.33)	1.78 (2.67)	1.63 (2.33)	1.22 (1.00)
Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	1.95 (3.33)	2.48 (6.00)	1.68 (2.33)	1.22 (1.00)	1.08 (0.67)
SEm ±	0.41	0.174	0.43	0.149	0.148
CD (P=0.05)	1.19	0.50	1.26	0.434	0.431

*Ethyl ester, DAA= Days after treatment application, NS= Non-significant

Data subjected to square root ($\sqrt{x}$ + 0.5) transformation and original data presented in parenthesis

Table 3. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels on density (No. m^{-2}) of *Vicia sativa* in wheat

Treatments	Weed density (No. m^{-2})				
	Pre-treatment	15 DAA	30 DAA	60 DAA	90 DAA
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})					
120	1.79 (2.67)	1.64 (2.60)	1.76 (3.33)	1.63 (2.33)	1.76 (2.67)
150	1.69 (2.67)	1.54 (2.33)	1.63 (2.33)	1.63 (2.33)	1.50 (2.00)
180	2.04 (3.67)	1.81 (3.00)	2.04 (3.67)	2.04 (3.67)	1.85 (3.00)
SEm ±	0.136	0.084	0.150	0.095	0.087
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Herbicides					

Weedy check	2.04 (3.67)	2.07 (4.00)	3.01 (8.67)	2.97 (8.33)	2.74 (4.00)
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	1.79 (2.67)	1.63 (2.33)	2.04 (3.67)	1.22 (1.00)	1.60 (2.33)
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	1.45 (3.00)	1.87 (3.00)	1.48 (1.67)	1.60 (2.33)	1.95 (3.33)
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	1.50 (2.00)	1.00 (0.67)	1.08 (0.67)	1.35 (1.33)	1.53 (0.67)
Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	1.95 (3.33)	1.87 (3.00)	1.22 (1.00)	1.00 (0.67)	1.85 (3.00)
SEm ±	0.119	0.128	0.148	0.166	0.182
CD (P=0.05)	0.346	0.373	0.431	0.484	0.532

*Ethyl ester, DAA= Days after treatment application, NS= Non-significant

Data subjected to square root ($\sqrt{x}$ + 0.5) transformation and original data presented in parenthesis

Table 4. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels on drymatter (g m^{-2}) of *Chenopodium album*in wheat

Treatments	Weed drymatter (g m^{-2})			
	15 DAA	**30 DAA**	**60 DAA**	**90 DAA**
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})				
120	0.83 (0.21)	0.90 (0.37)	0.92 (0.40)	1.13 (0.89)
150	0.96 (0.51)	0.96 (0.54)	1.06 (0.74)	1.15 (0.94)
180	1.00 (0.58)	1.01 (0.73)	1.05 (0.75)	1.21 (1.14)
SEm ±	0.010	0.024	0.020	0.031
CD (P=0.05)	0.038	NS	0.078	NS
Herbicides				
Weedy check	1.36 (1.43)	1.61 (2.20)	1.60 (2.12)	1.79 (2.74)
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	0.89 (0.31)	0.85 (0.23)	0.89 (0.31)	1.26 (1.10)
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.80 (0.14)	0.80 (0.15)	0.90 (0.33)	1.01 (0.53)
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.77 (0.10)	0.78 (0.11)	0.85 (0.24)	0.91 (0.36)

Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.83 (0.20)	0.73 (0.04)	0.81 (0.17)	0.84 (0.23)
SEm ±	0.019	0.060	0.041	0.056
CD (P=0.05)	0.055	0.174	0.120	0.162

*Ethyl ester, DAA= Days after treatment application, NS= Non-significant

Data subjected to square root ($\sqrt{x}$ + 0.5) transformation and original data presented in parenthesis

Table 5. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels on drymatter (g m^{-2}) of *Anagallis arvensis*in wheat

Treatments	Weed drymatter (g m^{-2})			
	15 DAA	**30 DAA**	**60 DAA**	**90 DAA**
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})				
120	0.89 (0.30)	0.88 (0.29)	1.09 (0.8)	1.19 (1.21)
150	0.91 (0.33)	0.94 (0.40)	1.12 (0.88)	1.19 (1.15)
180	0.91 (0.32)	0.96 (0.46)	1.10 (0.89)	1.23 (1.28)
SEm ±	0.013	0.010	0.018	0.069
CD (P=0.05)	NS	0.054	NS	NS
Herbicides				
Weedy check	0.98 (0.47)	1.21 (0.97)	1.82 (2.82)	2.16 (4.19)
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	0.84 (0.21)	0.85 (0.22)	0.92 (0.35)	1.15 (0.83)
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.88 (0.28)	0.90 (0.32)	0.96 (0.42)	0.97 (0.48)
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.89 (0.30)	0.85 (0.23)	0.95 (0.40)	0.89 (0.33)
Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.91 (0.33)	0.82 (0.18)	0.88 (0.28)	0.85 (0.25)
SEm ±	0.013	0.020	0.025	0.050
CD (P=0.05)	0.037	0.070	0.072	0.145

*Ethyl ester, DAA= Days after treatment application, NS= Non-significant

Data subjected to square root ($\sqrt{x}$ + 0.5) transformation and original data presented in parenthesis

Table 6. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels on drymatter (g m^{-2}) of *Vicia sativa* in wheat

Treatments	Weed drymatter (g m^{-2})			
	15 DAA	30 DAA	60 DAA	90 DAA
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})				
120	0.85 (0.23)	0.87 (0.27)	0.90 (0.36)	0.97 (0.51)
150	0.90 (0.18)	0.91 (0.33)	0.86 (0.30)	0.98 (0.51)
180	0.91 (0.32)	0.93 (0.39)	0.89 (0.34)	1.05 (0.67)
SEm ±	0.032	0.028	0.018	0.016
CD (P=0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS
Herbicides				
Weedy check	1.04 (0.58)	1.05 (0.61)	1.27 (1.13)	1.41 (1.49)
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	0.82 (0.18)	0.88 (0.28)	0.83 (0.20)	1.05 (0.62)
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.90 (0.32)	0.90 (0.32)	0.80 (0.15)	0.86 (0.25)
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.80 (0.14)	0.80 (0.14)	0.79 (0.13)	0.87 (0.26)
Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	0.88 (0.29)	0.88 (0.29)	0.73 (0.04)	0.83 (0.20)
SEm ±	0.030	0.028	0.039	0.042
CD (P=0.05)	0.087	0.083	0.113	0.123

*Ethyl ester, DAA= Days after treatment application, NS= Non-significant

Data subjected to square root ($\sqrt{x}$ + 0.5) transformation and original data presented in parenthesis

Table 7. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels weed control efficiency of *Chenopodium album*in wheat

Treatments	Weed control efficiency (%)			
	15 DAA	30 DAA	60 DAA	90 DAA
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})				
120	52.58	72.87	64.47	59.39
150	72.26	71.35	69.79	63.96

180	70.97	74.88	72.59	64.58
Herbicides				
Weedy check	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	66.66	85.47	82.42	56.86
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	85.65	89.37	83.78	78.77
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	91.18	94.49	87.55	85.90
Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	82.86	95.83	90.99	91.67

*Ethyl ester, DAA= Days after treatment application

Table 8. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels on weed control efficiency (%) of *Anagallisarvensis*in wheat

Treatments	Weed control efficiency (%)			
	15 DAA	**30 DAA**	**60 DAA**	**90 DAA**
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})				
120	31.78	63.62	68.21	72.59
150	37.00	55.01	68.46	70.20
180	24.50	61.53	71.88	70.66
Herbicides				
Weedy check	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	52.75	76.16	87.61	79.96
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	38.35	64.91	84.71	88.55
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	36.73	77.35	85.39	92.55
Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	27.63	81.85	89.87	94.69

Table 9. Effect of herbicides and nitrogen levels on weed control efficiency (%) of *Vicia sativa* in wheat

Treatments	Weed control efficiency (%)			
	15	**30**	**60**	**90**

	DAA	DAA	DAA	DAA
Nitrogen levels (kg ha^{-1})				
120	51.11	49.78	67.25	64.88
150	48.52	42.83	73.19	60.99
180	43.40	43.73	68.88	60.25
Herbicides				
Weedy check	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HW twice (30&60 DAS)	70.78	52.10	81.39	58.39
Pinoxaden 5.1% EC (40 ml) + 2,4-DEE* 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	42.27	46.92	85.82	82.87
Pendimethalin 30% EC (1000 ml) *fb* 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	73.33	76.30	84.90	81.95
Sulfosulfuron 75% WG (25 g) + 2,4-DEE 38% EC (750 ml ha^{-1})	52.00	51.92	96.75	86.98

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the summarized results, the following conclusions can be made: The combination of sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^-1) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}) demonstrated superior weed control effectiveness, leading to reduced weed density and lower dry matter of *Chenopodium album*, *Anagallis arvensis*, and *Vicia sativa*. The highest weed control efficiency, along with reduced weed dry weight and density, was achieved with the application of 180 kg N ha^{-1} in conjunction with sulfosulfuron (25 g ha^{-1}) and 2,4-D (750 ml ha^{-1}). This integrated approach not only enhanced weed management but also alleviated the negative impacts of increased weed dry weight and population on nutrient uptake and crop yield. Consequently, the findings highlight the benefits of combining herbicide treatments with strategic hand weeding to improve crop performance and resource use efficiency in wheat cultivation.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

REFERENCES

1. Chhokar RS, Sharma RK, Sharma I. Weed management strategies in wheat: A review. Journal of Wheat Research. 2012;4:1-21.

2. Singh S, Punia SS, Yadav A, Hooda VS. Evaluation of carfentrazone-ethyl + metsulfuron-methyl against broadleaf weeds of wheat. Indian Journal of Weed Sciences. 2011;43:12-22.

3. Pawar J, Singh R, Kabdal P, Prabhakar D, Kumar S. Optimization rate of pinoxaden+ clodinafop-propargyl for weed control in wheat. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2017;49(2): 136-138.

4. Sharma SN, Singh RK. Productivity and economics of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) as influenced by weed management and seed rate. Progressive Agriculture. 2011;11(2):242-250.

5. Shaktawat RPS, Somvanshi SPS, Bhadoria SS, Singh HP. Assessment of Premix Broad Spectrum Herbicides for Weed Management in Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.). Journal of Krishi Vigyan. 2019;7(2):11-14.

6. Gupta A, Yadav SS, Yadav LR, Gupta AK, Weed Management and Fertility Levels Influence on Weed Growth and Performance of Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.). International Journal of Current Microbiological Applied Sciences. 2019; 8(4):2038-2044.

7. Satyanarayana M, Reddy APK, Bhatt PS, Reddy SN, Padmaja J. Effect of Different Varieties and Levels of Nitrogen on Post-Harvest Parameters of Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.), International Journal of Pure Applied Biosciences. 2017;5(4):1645-1652.

8. Jackson ML. Soil Chemical Analysis, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India. 1973; 183-204.

9. Mani VS, Pandita ML, Gautam SK. Weed killing chemicals in potato cultivation, Indian Farming, 1973.

10. Patel SM, Patel JC, Chaudhary PP, Patel, DM, Patel, GN, Patel BM. Effects of nitrogen levels and weed management on production potential of wheat (Triticum aestivum L.). Research on Crops. 2012;13(2):456-462.

11. Shoeran S, Punia SS, Yadav A, Singh S. Bioefficacy of pinoxaden in combination with other herbicides against complex weed flora in wheat. Indian Journal of Weed Sciences. 2012;45:90-92.

12. Meena V, Kaushik MK, Dotaniya ML, Meena BP, Das H. Bio-efficacy of ready-mix herbicides on weeds and productivity in late-sown wheat. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2019;51(4):344-351.

13. Borowczak F, Rebarz K, Grzes S. Weed infestation of winter wheat depending on irrigation, cultivation technology and nitrogen fertilization in fourth four-field crop rotation. Journal of Research and Applications in Agricultural Engineering. 2012;57(3):22-25.

14. Katara P, Kumar S, Rana SS. Influence of pinoxaden in combination with other herbicides on nutrient depletion by weeds in wheat, Indian Journal Weed Sciences. 2015;47:371-375.

15. Sandhu BS, Dhaliwal NS. Chemical weed management to increase productivity of wheat. Indian Journal of Weed Science. 2016;48(4):381-383.

16. Singh M, Singh, MK, Singh SP, Sahu R. Herbicide and nitrogen application effects on weeds and yield of wheat. Indian Journal of Weed Sciences. 2015;47 (2):125-130.

17. Ghosh S, Das TK, Shivay YS, Bandyopadhyay KK, Bhatia A and Yeasin MD. Weed interference and wheat productivity in a conservation agriculture-based maize-wheat-mungbean system. Journal of Crop and Weed 2022 ;18(1): 111–19.

18. Gomez KA and Gomez AA. Statistical Procedure for Agricultural Research, 2nd edn. John Willey and Sons, New York. 1984.

19. Jeevan N, Singh JK, Singh MK, Sharma PK. Bio-efficacy of different herbicides and nitrogen levels on Cynodondactylon and Cyperusrotundus in wheat (Triticum aestivum L.).The Pharma Innovation Journal 2022; 11(7): 127-134