

## Effect of cultural and chemical weed control on productivity of fodder oat (*Avena sativa*) in arid Rajasthan

K.C. SHARMA AND SUBHASH CHANDER

Central Sheep and Wool Research Institute, Arid Region Campus, Bikaner, Rajasthan 334 006

Received : March 2006

### ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted during winter (*rabi*) season of 2002-03 and 2003-04 to find out the effective and economical weed-control measure in fodder oats (*Avena sativa* L.). The different weed-control treatments significantly controlled the weed flora and recorded 69.2 to 97.6% weed-control efficiency (WCE) at 45 days after sowing (DAS) and 59.3 to 98.0 per cent at 50% flowering stage. However, post-emergence application of 2,4-D proved phytotoxic by stunting the crop growth and narrowing the leaf area. Among weed-control treatments, weed-free treatment proved superior and produced highest fodder yields (GFY 42.9 t/ha DFY 11.05 t/ha), followed by post-emergence application of metsulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha + 1 hand-weeding. Economical analysis showed that application of metsulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha gave the maximum net returns (Rs 14,647) and benefit: cost ratio (1.79), followed by metsulfuron methyl 0.012 kg/ha+1 hand-weeding. Computation of energy relationship revealed that weed-free treatment was more energy efficient, recording highest energy ratio (9.46) and energy productivity (525.7 g/MJ), followed by post-emergence application of metsulfuron methyl @ 0.012 kg/ha (9.42 and 523.3 g/MJ).

**Key words :** Oats, Weed control, 2, 4-D, Metsulfuron methyl, Economics, Energy relationships

Oats (*Avena sativa* L.) is an important winter (*rabi*) season-fodder crop of India, rich in energy, protein, vitamin B, phosphorus and iron (Mehra, 1978). In arid region of Rajasthan the introduction of Indira Canal and the resultant increase in number of tubewells for irrigation provided an opportunity for farming community to grow fodder oats in large areas. Since it is grown under irrigated conditions, weed infestation is generally high; the severe crop-weed competition leads to major constraints in achieving higher fodder-productivity potential. The weed species associated with fodder oats like *Kharbathua* (*Chenopodium murale*) and wild hollyhock (*Althaea ludwigii*) are generally disliked by the animals. They not only decrease the fodder yield by 20% but also impair the fodder quality. Earlier studies indicate that no single weed-control practice is effective to control the weed density. The better strategy would be an integrated approach of weed control. The present study was undertaken to find out the effective, economical and energy-efficient weed-control practice for fodder oats by using some post-emergence herbicides and cultural practices as also their combination.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

The field experiment was conducted at research farm of the institute at Bikaner. The soil was sandy and low in

organic carbon (0.23%), available nitrogen (146.8 kg/ha), available phosphorus (7.8 kg P/ha) and available potassium (84.4 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha), with pH 8.54 and electrical conductivity (EC) 0.58 dS/m. Treatments consisted of: T<sub>1</sub>, one hand-weeding (HW) at 30 days; T<sub>2</sub>, two hand-weedings each at 20 and 40 days; T<sub>3</sub>, post-emergence application of 2,4-D @ 0.50 kg/ha; T<sub>4</sub>, 2,4-D @ 0.75 kg/ha; T<sub>5</sub>, 2,4-D @ 0.50 kg/ha, + 1 HW; T<sub>6</sub>, metsulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha; T<sub>7</sub>, metsulfuron methyl @ 0.012 kg/ha; T<sub>8</sub>, metsulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha + 1 HW; T<sub>9</sub>, weedy check; and T<sub>10</sub>, weed-free treatment. This trial was undertaken in randomized block design (RBD) with three replications. Both the herbicides were sprayed at post emergence stage at 4 weeks of crop age (at tillering after 5-leaf stage) with a manually operated foot-spray using flat fan nozzle and one hand-weeding in treatment T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>8</sub> was done at 40 days after sowing. Metsulfuron methyl was sprayed along with recommended quantity of the surfactant. The crop was sown on 2 December 2002 and 6 December 2003. Oat 'Kent' was sown 30 cm apart in rows. Sheep manure @ 10 t/ha was applied uniformly at the time of field preparation and the crop was fertilized with 90 kg N/ha through urea and 40 kg P and K/ha each through single superphosphate and muriate of potash respectively. The crop was irrigated as and when required and a total 6 irrigations

each were applied in both the years. All other recommended packages of practices was adopted to raise a healthy crop. The crop was harvested at 50% flowering. At the time of harvest the weed samples were collected from 1 m<sup>2</sup> quadrat from each plot to determine weed density and dry weight at 45 days after sowing and 50% flowering stage. The energy relationships were computed as suggested by Panesar and Bhatnagar (1987).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Weed flora

The major weed species were mainly broad-leaf weeds, viz. *kasani* (*Chicorium intybus*), *khartua* or *kharbathua* (*Chenopodium murale*), wild hollyhock (*Althaea ludwigii*), *piajee* (*Asphodelus tenuifolius*), badi duddhi (*Euphorbia hirta*) and *gokhru* (*Tribulus terrestris*). The density of grassy weeds, viz. *Motha* (*Cyperus rotundus*) and doob grass (*Cynodon dactylon*) was found to be much less in the experimental field. *C. intybus*, *C. murale* and *A. ludwigii* were the most predominant weed species, with average density of 58, 29 and 11% respectively.

### Weed dynamics

The density and dry weight of weeds were significantly

reduced due to all weed-control practices in both the years compared with the weedy check (Table 1) at both the stages. Mean data over 2 years showed that weed-control efficiency (WCE) was 71.3 to 96.9% at 45 days after sowing (DAS), being maximum with two hand-weedings. This was followed by application of mesulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha + 1 HW. However, at 50% flowering stage the latter treatment recorded the highest WCE (97.5%), followed by application of 2,4-D @ 0.50 kg/ha + 1 HW. Application of 2,4-D at both the doses proved phytotoxic and stunted the plant growth and narrowed the leaf area (Table 2). Weed index varied from 1.3 to 25.8% during the study. Application of metsulfuron methyl at different doses recorded the lowest weed index, and a similar position was obtained from one or two hand-weedings. However, application of 2,4-D at both the doses recorded higher weed index due to phyto-toxicity, which was almost similar to or more than the weedy check. Pandey *et al.* (2001) also reported that mesulfuron methyl alone or in combination with 2,4-D Na gave excellent control of broad-leaf weed species in wheat.

### Growth and fodder yield

The weed-free environment gave the maximum green-fodder and dry-matter yields (GFY 42.9 t/ha and DMY

**Table 1.** Weed dynamics at 45 days after sowing and at 50% flowering as affected by different weed-control practices in oats

| Treatment                             | At 45 days after sowing      |                   |                                          |                 |         |         |      | At 50% flowering |         |      | Weed index |         |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------|---------|---------|------|------------------|---------|------|------------|---------|
|                                       | No. of weeds*/m <sup>2</sup> |                   | Dry weight of weeds* (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) |                 | WCE (%) |         |      | WCE (%)          |         |      | Weed index |         |
|                                       | 2002-03                      | 2003-04           | 2002-03                                  | 2003-04         | 2002-03 | 2003-04 | Mean | 2002-03          | 2003-04 | Mean | 2002-03    | 2003-04 |
|                                       |                              |                   |                                          |                 |         |         |      |                  |         |      |            |         |
| T <sub>1</sub> One HW at 30 DAS       | 6.78<br>(46.2)               | 7.53<br>(56.80)   | 6.02<br>(35.80)                          | 6.17<br>(39.70) | 74.8    | 73.9    | 74.3 | 85.9             | 78.9    | 82.4 | 3.3        | 9.2     |
| T <sub>2</sub> Two HW at 20, 40 DAS   | 2.66<br>(6.70)               | 2.40<br>(5.30)    | 2.78<br>(7.30)                           | 3.02<br>(8.70)  | 96.3    | 97.6    | 96.9 | 95.9             | 95.5    | 95.7 | 3.1        | 8.3     |
| T <sub>3</sub> 2, 4-D @ 0.5 kg        | 5.28<br>(27.80)              | 7.99<br>(63.80)   | 4.49<br>(19.80)                          | 4.68<br>(21.50) | 84.8    | 70.8    | 77.8 | 90.1             | 59.3    | 74.7 | 14.4       | 24.2    |
| T <sub>4</sub> 2, 4-D @ 0.75 kg       | 4.32<br>(18.50)              | 7.38<br>(54.30)   | 3.43<br>(11.30)                          | 3.77<br>(13.70) | 89.9    | 75.1    | 82.5 | 94.4             | 69.5    | 81.9 | 20.2       | 25.8    |
| T <sub>5</sub> 2, 4-D @ 0.5 kg + 1 HW | 2.48<br>(5.70)               | 3.48<br>(4.70)    | 2.49<br>(5.70)                           | 2.50<br>(5.90)  | 96.9    | 94.6    | 95.7 | 97.3             | 96.3    | 96.8 | 18.8       | 21.9    |
| T <sub>6</sub> MM @ 0.008 kg          | 7.01<br>(48.70)              | 8.23<br>(67.30)   | 4.55<br>(20.30)                          | 4.71<br>(21.80) | 73.4    | 69.2    | 71.3 | 93.6             | 83.1    | 88.3 | 5.5        | 8.9     |
| T <sub>7</sub> MM @ 0.012 kg          | 6.75<br>(45.30)              | 7.11<br>(50.70)   | 3.19<br>(9.70)                           | 4.44<br>(19.30) | 75.3    | 76.8    | 76.0 | 95.1             | 87.1    | 91.1 | 1.3        | 10.7    |
| T <sub>8</sub> MM @ 0.008 kg+1 HW     | 2.64<br>(6.50)               | 2.94<br>(8.30)    | 2.68<br>(6.90)                           | 3.02<br>(8.70)  | 96.4    | 96.2    | 96.3 | 98.0             | 97.1    | 97.5 | 2.7        | 8.1     |
| T <sub>9</sub> Weedy check            | 13.54<br>(183.30)            | 14.78<br>(218.30) | 9.38<br>(87.80)                          | 9.83<br>(96.30) |         |         |      |                  |         |      | 21.7       | 22.2    |
| T <sub>10</sub> Weed-free treatment   | 0.71<br>(0)                  | 0.71<br>(0)       | 0.71<br>(0)                              | 0.71<br>(0)     | 100     | 100     | 100  | 100              | 100     | 100  | -          | -       |
| CD (P=0.05)                           | 1.05                         | 1.05              | 0.58                                     | 0.60            |         |         |      |                  |         |      |            |         |

Number and dry weight of weeds are transformed values  $\sqrt{x+0.5}$ , and figures in parentheses are actual number and weights  
HW=Hand-weeding; PoE=post-emergence; WCE=weed-control efficiency; and MM=metsulfuron methyl

11.05 t/ha). This treatment was statistically on a par with that of post-emergence application of metsulfuron methyl at both the doses and one or two hand-weedings, but significantly higher than that of weedy check and application of 2,4-D (Table 2). Application of 2,4-D at both the doses significantly decreased the fodder yield and recorded similar yields with the weedy check treatment. Higher yield under weed-free treatment on application of metsulfuron methyl was the function of higher plant height and number of plants per unit area. However, lower fodder yield in the plot treated with 2,4-D was the function of lower number of plants, tiller height and leaf-area index (Table 2) due to phytotoxicity. Higher fodder yield in weed-free treatment may be ascribed to the lower crop-weed competition for air, light, nutrients and water, where the crop plants performed well under stress-free environment and produced higher yield. Kumar *et al.* (2001) also reported similar results.

### Economics

On the basis of prevalent market prices of different inputs and outputs, economic analysis of oats cultivation was done (Table 2). Higher net returns were realized with the application of metsulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha, followed by its higher dose @ 0.012 kg/ha and weed-free treatment. Similarly, highest B:C ratio was recorded with metsulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha, followed by that @ 0.012 kg/ha and the treatment of one hand-weeding only. Higher net returns and B:C ratio found with the application of mesulfuron methyl treatment might be due to cost-effective weed-control technique. But weed-free treatment in spite of higher fodder yields could not achieve the simi-

lar level of net returns and B:C ratio values of as obtained with metsulfuron methyl due to increased cost on repeated manual weeding. These results are in close agreement with the findings of Naik *et al.* (2001).

### Energy relationships

Energy used in oats cultivation under different weed-control treatments was computed to augment the energy-use efficiency (Table 2). As per computation, input energy differed due to difference in energy use under different weed-control techniques. The output energy, however, is dependent on dry-fodder yield (DFY) under different treatments and higher fodder yields registered greater output energy. Hence energy ratio (output : input ratio) and energy productivity per unit of energy used (in Mega Joule) may be considered for energy relationships. Among weed-control practices, weed-free treatment recorded the maximum energy ratio and energy productivity, followed by higher dose of metsulfuron methyl, i.e. 0.012 kg/ha. Higher energy ratio and energy productivity might be caused by higher production of output energy due to higher fodder yields and lower input energy use in comparison to other treatments.

On the basis of 2 years data, it is inferred that weed-free environment holds promise to provide higher and energy-efficient fodder production, but application of metsulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha produced more economical fodder. Hence in the condition of costly or unavailability of manual labour, application of metsulfuron methyl @ 0.008 kg/ha at 4 weeks of crop age (at tillering) may be recommended for farmer's use to control weeds in fodder oats in arid region of Rajasthan.

**Table 2.** Growth, fodder yield, energy relationship and economics as affected by different weed-control treatments in oats

| Treatment                              | Green fodder (t/ha) |         | Dry matter and growth attributes (pooled analysis of 2 years) |                    |                       |                 | Energy productivity       |                            |              |                            | Economics          |           |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
|                                        | 2002-03             | 2003-04 | Dry matter (t/ha)                                             | Tiller height (cm) | Tiller number (m row) | Leaf-area index | Energy input ('000 MJ/ha) | Energy output ('000 MJ/ha) | Energy ratio | Energy productivity (g/MJ) | Net returns Rs/ha) | B:C ratio |
| T <sub>1</sub> : One HW                | 43.8                | 38.7    | 10.33                                                         | 118.2              | 108.8                 | 11.55           | 20.23                     | 185.9                      | 9.19         | 510.5                      | 14,103             | 1.75      |
| T <sub>2</sub> : two HW                | 43.5                | 39.5    | 10.42                                                         | 118.6              | 112.2                 | 11.65           | 20.63                     | 187.6                      | 9.09         | 505.2                      | 13,103             | 1.65      |
| T <sub>3</sub> : 2,4-D @ 0.5 kg        | 38.6                | 31.6    | 8.92                                                          | 109.6              | 102.2                 | 8.55            | 19.91                     | 160.6                      | 8.07         | 448.1                      | 10,013             | 1.55      |
| T <sub>4</sub> : 2,4-D @ 0.75 kg       | 35.8                | 30.6    | 8.51                                                          | 108.1              | 101.5                 | 8.15            | 20.00                     | 153.2                      | 7.66         | 425.5                      | 8,349              | 1.46      |
| T <sub>5</sub> : 2,4-D @ 0.5 kg + 1 HW | 36.7                | 32.8    | 8.80                                                          | 108.6              | 103.2                 | 9.05            | 20.46                     | 158.4                      | 7.74         | 430.1                      | 8,533              | 1.44      |
| T <sub>6</sub> : MM @ 0.008 kg         | 42.5                | 40.4    | 10.25                                                         | 118.7              | 107.4                 | 11.75           | 19.85                     | 184.5                      | 9.30         | 516.4                      | 14,647             | 1.79      |
| T <sub>7</sub> : MM @ 0.012 kg         | 44.3                | 39.3    | 10.39                                                         | 115.7              | 110.1                 | 11.50           | 19.86                     | 187.0                      | 9.42         | 523.3                      | 14,577             | 1.77      |
| T <sub>8</sub> : MM @ 0.008 kg + 1 HW  | 43.8                | 40.8    | 10.45                                                         | 119.5              | 108.6                 | 11.50           | 20.25                     | 188.1                      | 9.29         | 516.0                      | 14,127             | 1.72      |
| T <sub>9</sub> : Weedy check           | 35.6                | 33.8    | 8.62                                                          | 133.3              | 105.0                 | 11.25           | 19.84                     | 155.2                      | 7.82         | 434.4                      | 10,063             | 1.57      |
| T <sub>10</sub> : Weed-free treatment  | 44.8                | 41.0    | 11.05                                                         | 120.9              | 113.0                 | 11.90           | 21.02                     | 198.0                      | 9.46         | 525.7                      | 13,023             | 1.61      |
| CD (P=0.05)                            | 5.3                 | 4.0     | 0.88                                                          | 3.9                | 6.0                   | 0.71            |                           |                            |              |                            | 2,565              | 0.14      |

MM=Metsulfuron methyl

## REFERENCES

- Chopra, N., Singh, H.P. and Chopra, N.K. 2001. Performance of metsulfuron methyl and pendimethalin alone and their mixture with isoproturon on weed control in wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) seed crop. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **46**: 239–245.
- Kumar, S., Rawat, C.R., Hazra, C.R., Singh, K. and Arya, O.N. 2001. Response of integrated weed management practices on growth, yield and economics of fodder oats (*Avena sativa*). *Forage Research* **27** : 15–20.
- Mehra, K.L. 1978. Oats, P. 1. Technical Bulletin, ICAR, New Delhi.
- Naik, K.R., Shaikh, N.P., Agrawal, S.B. and Dubey, K.M. 2001. Integrated weed management in fodder oat (*Avena sativa* L.). *Forage Research* **27** : 185–187.
- Pandey, J., Mishra, B.N. and Verma, A.K. 2001. Effect of metsulfuron methyl, 2,4-D and their tank mix on weeds and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Annals of Agricultural Research* **27** : 100–103.
- Panesar, S.B. and Bhatnagar, A.P. 1987. Energy norms for input and output of agricultural sector. (In): *Proceedings of National Conference on Energy in Production Agriculture and feed Processing*, pp. 8–26. held at Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana.