www.ThePharmaJournal.com

# **The Pharma Innovation**



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695 ISSN (P): 2349-8242 NAAS Rating: 5.03 TPI 2021; 10(3): 217-222 © 2021 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com Received: 17-12-2020 Accepted: 29-01-2021

#### Lalita Kumar Mohanty

- a. Ph.D. (Agronomy) Scholar, OUAT, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India
- b. Senior Scientist and Head (I/C), KVK, Odisha, India

Sankarsan Nanda Former Dean Extension Education, OUAT, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

Lalita Mohan Garnayak

Dean Extension Education, OUAT, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

### Effect of integrated nutrient management and weed control practices on growth and yield attributes of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) in rice-groundnut cropping system

#### Lalita Kumar Mohanty, Sankarsan Nanda and Lalita Mohan Garnayak

#### DOI: https://doi.org/10.22271/tpi.2021.v10.i3d.5771

#### Abstract

A field experiment was conducted at Instructional farm of Krishi Vigyan Kendra Kendrapara, Odisha during *kharif* and *rabi* seasons of 2013-14 and 2014-15 in rice-groundnut cropping system under irrigated medium land situation. The soil of the experimental site was sandy loam in texture with pH of 5.7, organic carbon of 0.52% having available soil nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium of 390.9 kg/ha, 10.1 kg/ha and 190.1 kg/ha respectively. Rice crop (var. Sahabhagi dhan) was transplanted in *kharif* season taking nine treatments having three levels of nutrient management practice and three level of weed management with three replications. Further during *rabi* season each main plot was divided into two subplots taking groundnut (var. Devi) with two levels of weed management practices under split plot design. The pooled data revealed that growth of rice and yield attributes were significantly higher in treatment of RDF (75% N) with green manuring of *dhaincha (Sesbania aculeata)* with pre emergence application of herbicide oxadiargyl followed by post emergence bispyribac-sodium which recorded higher plant height (96.35 cm), number of tillers per plant (212.7), Leaf area index (4.4), dry matter accumulation (1347.5 g/plant), panicle length (25.8 cm) and test weight (22.33 g).

Keywords: Rice-groundnut cropping system, yield attributes of rice, oxadiargyl, bispyribac-sodium green manuring of *dhaincha* 

#### Introduction

Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) is one of the most important cereal foods of the world. Rice feeds fifty percent of the world population and contributes nineteen percent of the global calories intake (IRRI, 2014)<sup>[5,20]</sup>. Rice is cultivated in 112 countries of world covering every continent and it is consumed by 2.5 billion people in developing countries, mostly in Asia (90%) and the rest (10%) in America, Africa, Australia and Europe. To meet global rice demand, it is projected that an additional 96 million tons of milled rice will be needed by 2040 as compared to 2015 (Valera and Belie, 2020)<sup>[20]</sup>. India is the world's top rice producing country in terms of area and ranked second in terms of production. Though eastern India occupies 61.3% of the rice area of the country (27 million ha), it contributes only 48% of the total rice production and it has much lower growth rate of rice yield compared to other regions of the country. Therefore, research initiatives are imperative in this area to address the production constraints and coming up with suitable solutions.

Rice is a heavy nitrogen feeder, but fertilizer nitrogen use-efficiency is very low under tropical conditions, where it rarely exceeds 50% and usually ranges between 15 and 35%. Complementary use of organic and biological source of plant nutrient along with chemical fertilizer is of great importance for the maintenance of soil health and productivity, especially under intensive cropping system. Integrated use of organic manures and chemical fertilizers has advantages over use of only organic manures or chemical fertilizers (Kumar *et al.*, 2009) <sup>[7]</sup>. Since sourcing of organic manure is difficult and the crop response to them during initial stages is not as spectacular, compared to the chemical fertilizers, an integrated approach of plant nutrition involving the judicious mix of organic and chemical could be helpful to sustain optimum yield and to restore the residual soil fertility. Out of the organic sources available for use in rice production, farmyard manure is the proven source of nutrition, but its availability is quite inadequate (Mishra and Prasad, 2000) <sup>[13]</sup>. This necessitates searching for organics such as green manuring and use of biofertiliser. Incorporation of farm yard manure and green manure in combination with inorganic fertilizers improve the productivity of component crops in cropping sequence ameliorates and sustain soil health and also economise fertiliser need.

#### Corresponding Author: Lalita Kumar Mohanty

a. Ph.D. (Agronomy) Scholar, OUAT, Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India

b. Senior Scientist and Head (I/C), KVK, Odisha, India

#### (Mundra et al., 2003) [11].

As a green manure crop, *dhaincha* can substitute for applied fertilizer nitrogen (Raju and Reedy, 2000) <sup>[14, 15]</sup> in addition to supplying organic matter for the restoration of soil physical conditions. The use of *dhaincha* (*Sesbania aculeata*) as green manure improves soil productivity through biological nitrogen fixation (Ladha, *et al.*, 2000) <sup>[8, 9, 16]</sup>. *Dhaincha* as green manure increases uptake of P, K, Zn, Fe, Mn, and Cu by rice plants (Vaiyapuri and Sriramachandrasekharan, 2001) <sup>[19]</sup>.

Weeds play a key role and reduce the crop yield by more than 35% on an average (Sattin and Berti, 2003) [17]. Weed infestation in rice remains the largest constraint, limiting its productivity. A major hindrance in the successful cultivation of rice is heavy infestation of weeds (Parthipan et al, 2013) <sup>[12]</sup>. Manual removal of weed is labour intensive, tedious and does not ensure weed removal at critical stages of crop-weed competition. The choice of chemical herbicides depends upon weed type and degree of weed infestation in rice field. Herbicides are effective against weed species but most of them are specific and are effective against narrow range of weed species (Mukherjee and Singh 2005) <sup>[10]</sup>. Thus effective weed control often requires a combination of cultural, mechanical and chemical control such as an integrated weed management approach to delay herbicide resistance and reduce the herbicide load in the agro-ecosystem (Rao et al., 2007) [16].

#### **Materials and Methods**

The field experiment was conducted at instructional farm of Krishi Vigyan Kendra Kendrapara, Odisha in rice-groundnut cropping system during kharif and rabi seasons of 2013-14 and 2014-15 under irrigated medium land situation where rice was grown as *kharif* crop and groundnut as *rabi* crop. The experimental site was situated at 20° 53'N latitude and 86° 46/E longitude at an altitude of 11.9 m above the mean sea level. The soil of the experimental site was sandy loam in texture with pH of 5.7, organic carbon of 0.52% having available soil nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium of 390.9 kg/ha, 10.1 kg/ha and 190.1 kg/ha respectively. The green manure crop *dhaincha* followed by rice were grown from 22<sup>nd</sup> standard meteorological week (SMW) (28 May-3 June) to 44th SMW (29-04 November) during kharif 2013 as well as in 2014 .Total rainfall amounting to 1731.5 mm in 91 rainy days and 1266.0 mm in 83 rainy days were received during kharif 2013 and 2014 respectively. During kharif season three levels each of nutrient and weed management practices in rice were tried in randomized block design (RBD) with three replications. The treatments were randomly allotted to the plots such as (1) N<sub>1</sub>W<sub>1</sub>-RDF (60-30-30 N-P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>-K<sub>2</sub>O kg/ha.) + Weedy check, (2)  $N_1W_2$ -RDF + Pre emergence herbicide (oxadiargyl 80% WP) @ 90g/ha at 3 DAT (Day after transplanting) + Hand Weeding (HW) at 25 DAT, (3)  $N_1W_3$ -RDF + Pre em. (oxadiargyl 80% WP) @ 90g/ha at 3 DAT + Post em. (bispyribac sodium 10% SL) @ 200ml/ha at 15 DAT, (4) N<sub>2</sub>W<sub>1</sub>- RDF (75%N) + GM (Green manuring) dhaincha (Sesbania aculeata) + Weedy check, (5)  $N_2W_2$ - RDF (75%N) + GM dhaincha + Pre em. (oxadiargyl 80% WP) @ 90g/ha at 3 DAT + HW at 25 DAT, (6)  $N_2W_3$ - RDF (75%N) + GM dhaincha + Pre em. (oxadiargyl 80% WP) @ 90g/ha at 3 DAT + Post em. (bispyribac sodium 10%SL) @ 200ml/ha at

15 DAT, (7)  $N_3W_1$  - RDF (50%N) + GM *dhaincha* + Weedy check, (8)  $N_3W_2$ - RDF (50%N) + GM *dhaincha* + Pre em. (oxadiargyl 80% WP) @ 90g/ha at 3 DAT + HW at 25 DAT, (9)  $N_3W_3$ -RDF (50%N) + GM *dhaincha* + Pre em. (oxadiargyl 80% WP) @ 90g/ha at 3 DAT + Post em. (bispyribac sodium 10%SL) @ 200ml/ha at 15 DAT in randomized block design.

Each main plot was divided into two sub-plots during *rabi* season. The residual effects of three levels each of nutrient and weed management practices imposed in rice and two levels of weed management practices in groundnut were tried with split plot design (SPD) with three replications. The same layout was maintained during the second year of experimentation.

#### **Results and Discussions**

### Effect of INM and weed control practices on plant height (cm) of rice

Data on plant height of rice recorded at 15 days interval from 15 DAT to 60 DAT and harvest are presented under Table 1. The results revealed that, the plant height at 75% N RDF coupled with pre emergence application of oxadiargyl with one hand weeding (HW) recorded significantly higher plant height in all stages of observations (15 DAT to harvest). Next in order was 100% RDF + oxadiargyl followed by bispyribac sodium. As regards to weed management practices oxadiargyl followed by bispyribac sodium succeeded to all treatments and recorded significantly higher height in all stages of observations during *kharif* 2013.

The impact of nutrient management maintained similar trend to that of results presented in *kharif* 2013-14. The height was significantly higher with application of oxadiargyl followed by bispyribac sodium at all its growth stages. It corroborates the findings of Yadav *et al.* (2010) <sup>[22]</sup>. Application of herbicide both pre and post also could negatively supported weed density and kept the crop free of crop weed competition which benefited the crop to grow faster.

## Effect of INM and weed control practices on tillers/m<sup>2</sup> of rice

Data on number of tillers per m<sup>2</sup> on rice was recorded on all stages of observations, during kharif 2013 and 2014. The results revealed that, in respect to nutrient management indicated that 75% N RDF with green manuring of dhaincha recorded significantly higher tillers per m<sup>2</sup> from 15 DAT to 60 DAT and harvest. In case of weed management practices pre em. Application of oxadiargyl followed by bispyribac sodium recorded significantly higher number of tillers per m<sup>2</sup> in all 5 stages of observations. However, it was at par with pre emergence application of oxadiargyl + one HW at 25 DAT during *kharif* 2013. The results on the number of tillers per m<sup>2</sup> during 2014 revealed that 75% N RDF + green manuring could succeed in recording significantly higher number of tillers as compared to 50% N (RDF) + green manuringof *dhaincha*. As regards to weed management practices, W<sub>3</sub> had added advantage over  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  in recording significantly higher number of tillers at 15 DAT only, but W<sub>2</sub> succeeded  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  at 30 DAT, 45 and 60 DAT. The result corroborated the findings of Raju and Pandian (2001) <sup>[14, 15]</sup> and Kiran et al. (2010)<sup>[6]</sup>.

| Treatmonta            | 15 DAT | 20 D A T | 45 DAT  |        | Howwood |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--------|----------|---------|--------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Treatments            | 15 DAT |          | 45 DA 1 | 00 DA1 | naivest |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                       |        |          |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $N_1$                 | 39.0   | 55.3     | 73.5    | 84.1   | 88.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $N_2$                 | 47.5   | 66.7     | 80.8    | 92.5   | 97.9    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N3                    | 43.5   | 63.2     | 78.4    | 86.5   | 89.7    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 1.4    | 1.5      | 1.6     | 1.1    | 1.6     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 4.2    | 4.5      | 4.8     | 3.3    | 4.8     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W1                    | 35.5   | 53.6     | 60.5    | 72.0   | 80.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $W_2$                 | 42.6   | 55.7     | 72.5    | 79.5   | 87.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>3</sub> | 45.5   | 60.8     | 74.5    | 78.8   | 88.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 1.5    | 1.6      | 1.7     | 1.1    | 1.6     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 4.5    | 4.8      | 5.1     | 3.3    | 4.8     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                       |        | 2014     |         |        |         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N1                    | 43.0   | 60.1     | 70.5    | 80.1   | 86.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N2                    | 49.6   | 68.5     | 82.8    | 98.4   | 94.8    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N3                    | 47.4   | 64.2     | 80.1    | 89.6   | 92.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 1.5    | 1.6      | 1.7     | 1.1    | 1.6     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 4.5    | 4.8      | 5.1     | 3.3    | 4.8     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W1                    | 39.5   | 56.6     | 63.5    | 75.0   | 82.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>2</sub> | 46.6   | 53.8     | 75.5    | 84.5   | 91.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| W3                    | 49.5   | 62.5     | 78.5    | 79.8   | 83.5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 1.5    | 1.6      | 1.7     | 1.1    | 1.6     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD ( <i>P</i> =0.05)  | 4.5    | 4.8      | 5.1     | 3.3    | 4.8     |  |  |  |  |  |  |

 Table 1: Effect of INM and weed control practices on plant height (cm) of rice

 $N_1 - RDF$  (60-30-30  $N-P_2O_5-K_2O$  kg/ha.),  $N_2 - RDF$  (75% N) + GM *dhaincha*,  $N_3 - RDF$  (50% N) + GM *dhaincha*,  $W_1$  - Control (Weedy check),  $W_2$  - Pre em. oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + HW at 25 DAT,  $W_3$  - PE oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + Post em. bispyribac sodium at 15 DAT

| Table 2: Effect of INM and weed control pra | ractices on tillers/m <sup>2</sup> of rice |
|---|--|
|---|--|

| Treatments            | 15 DAT | 30 DAT | 45 DAT | 60 DAT | Harvest |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| 2013                  |        |        |        |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| N1                    | 145.0  | 174.8  | 197.2  | 209.7  | 204.5   |  |  |  |  |
| N <sub>2</sub>        | 185.4  | 200.5  | 210    | 225    | 215     |  |  |  |  |
| N <sub>3</sub>        | 175    | 185    | 205    | 212    | 208     |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 11.5   | 12.5   | 16.5   | 17.0   | 13.5    |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 34.5   | 37.5   | 49.5   | 51.0   | 40.5    |  |  |  |  |
| $W_1$                 | 125.0  | 164.8  | 187.2  | 199.7  | 192.5   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>2</sub> | 170.4  | 178.5  | 205    | 215    | 209     |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>3</sub> | 176.5  | 181.4  | 200.1  | 212    | 202     |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 11.5   | 12.5   | 16.5   | 17.0   | 13.5    |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 34.5   | 37.5   | 49.5   | 51.0   | 40.5    |  |  |  |  |
|                       |        | 2014   |        |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| N1                    | 148.0  | 179.8  | 200.2  | 212.7  | 208.5   |  |  |  |  |
| N2                    | 188.4  | 207.5  | 215    | 229    | 219     |  |  |  |  |
| N3                    | 179    | 192    | 208    | 218    | 216     |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 11.5   | 12.5   | 16.5   | 17.0   | 13.5    |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 34.5   | 37.5   | 49.5   | 51.0   | 40.5    |  |  |  |  |
| $W_1$                 | 135.0  | 174.8  | 189.2  | 198.5  | 198.5   |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>2</sub> | 180.4  | 188.5  | 208    | 219    | 212     |  |  |  |  |
| W <sub>3</sub>        | 186.5  | 183.4  | 205    | 218    | 215     |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 11.5   | 12.5   | 16.5   | 17.0   | 13.5    |  |  |  |  |

 $N_1$  - RDF (60-30-30 N-P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>-K<sub>2</sub>O kg/ha.),  $N_2$  - RDF (75%N) + GM *dhaincha*,  $N_3$  - RDF (50%N) + GM *dhaincha*,  $W_1$  - Control (Weedy check),  $W_2$  - Pre em. oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + HW at 25 DAT,  $W_3$  - PE oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + Post em. bispyribac sodium at 15 DAT

### Effect of INM and weed control practices on leaf area index (LAI) of rice

The effect of INM and weed control practices on leaf area index (LAI) of rice for the year 2013-14 is shown in Table 3. It was revealing to mention that the leaf area index of rice increased progressively from 15 DAT to 60 DAT and then decreased at the time of harvest. The leaf area index reached maximum at 60 DAT in all the treatments. However, the leaf area index was found significantly higher in N<sub>2</sub> as compared to N<sub>1</sub> and N<sub>3</sub>. Similarly the leaf area index was found significantly higher in W<sub>3</sub> in comparison to W<sub>1</sub> and W<sub>2</sub>. During kharif 2014 the leaf area index continued to increase up to 60 DAT and decreased slowly at harvest. The trend was observed in both fertility level and weed control practices. There was significant increase in LAI due to 100% RDF. It was just followed by 75% N (RDF) + GM *dhaincha*. The data on *kharif* 2014 revealed that N<sub>2</sub> recorded significantly higher LAI on all stages of observation. The weed control method applied to *kharif* rice during 2014 indicated that LAI was increased from 15DAT to 60 DAT and then decreased. W<sub>3</sub> recorded significantly higher LAI in all stages of growth and is followed by W<sub>1</sub> and W<sub>2</sub>. The pre emergence application of herbicide Oxadiargyl followed by post emergence application of Bispyribac sodium could support the both parameters because of control of grassy weeds and broadleaf weeds before boot leaf stage and kept the crop free of competition

weeds. Similar findings were recorded by Goel and Verma (2000) <sup>[3]</sup>, Singh *et al.* (2006) <sup>[8, 10, 11, 13, 18]</sup>, Brar and Bhullar

(2013)<sup>[1]</sup> and Kiran et al. (2010)<sup>[6]</sup>.

| Treatments            | 15 DAT | 30 DAT | 45 DAT | 60 DAT | Harvest |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| 2013                  |        |        |        |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| N1                    | 2.7    | 3.75   | 4.54   | 4.95   | 3.95    |  |  |  |  |
| $N_2$                 | 3.5    | 4.15   | 4.84   | 5.21   | 4.35    |  |  |  |  |
| N <sub>3</sub>        | 3.31   | 4.02   | 4.53   | 5.01   | 4.40    |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 0.11   | 0.04   | 0.08   | 0.06   | 0.04    |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 0.33   | 0.12   | 0.23   | 0.17   | 0.16    |  |  |  |  |
| $W_1$                 | 3.37   | 4.49   | 5.20   | 4.14   | 3.14    |  |  |  |  |
| $W_2$                 | 3.80   | 5.35   | 5.43   | 4.35   | 4.03    |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>3</sub> | 3.99   | 5.58   | 5.64   | 4.69   | 4.24    |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 0.14   | 0.03   | 0.07   | 0.05   | 0.03    |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 0.42   | 0.10   | 0.23   | 0.14   | 0.1     |  |  |  |  |
|                       |        | 2014   |        |        |         |  |  |  |  |
| N1                    | 3.15   | 3.59   | 3.76   | 5.35   | 3.76    |  |  |  |  |
| $N_2$                 | 3.25   | 4.3    | 4.15   | 5.7    | 4.15    |  |  |  |  |
| N3                    | 3.46   | 4.41   | 4.35   | 5.27   | 4.35    |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 0.05   | 0.06   | 0.21   | 0.55   | 0.06    |  |  |  |  |
| CD ( <i>P</i> =0.05)  | 0.16   | 0.19   | 0.66   | 1.70   | 0.17    |  |  |  |  |
| $W_1$                 | 3.18   | 3.79   | 3.92   | 5.43   | 3.92    |  |  |  |  |
| $W_2$                 | 3.51   | 4.91   | 5.17   | 5.17   | 5.01    |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>3</sub> | 3.79   | 4.34   | 5.39   | 5.83   | 5.03    |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 0.05   | 0.06   | 0.21   | 0.55   | 0.06    |  |  |  |  |
| CD ( <i>P</i> =0.05)  | 0.16   | 0.19   | 0.66   | 1.70   | 0.17    |  |  |  |  |

 Table 3: Effect of INM and weed control practices on LAI of rice

 $N_1 - RDF$  (60-30-30  $N-P_2O_5-K_2O$  kg/ha.),  $N_2 - RDF$  (75%N) + GM *dhaincha*,  $N_3 - RDF$  (50%N) + GM *dhaincha*,  $W_1$  - Control (Weedy check),  $W_2$  - Pre em. oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + HW at 25 DAT,  $W_3$  - PE oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + Post em. bispyribac sodium at 15 DAT

### Effect of INM and weed control practices on dry matter accumulation of $(g/m^2)$ rice

The data on dry matter accumulation of rice during *kharif* 2013 and 2014 is presented under Table 4. The data revealed that dry matter production increased progressively up to harvest. Interestingly,  $N_3$  recorded significantly higher dry weight in all stages of growth. It was just followed by  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ . As regards to weed management practices in *kharif* rice  $W_3$  had the added advantage in recording significantly higher dry matter at all stages of growth and was just followed by  $W_2$ 

and  $W_1$  during *kharif* 2014. N<sub>3</sub> recorded significantly higher dry matter production in comparison to N<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>1</sub>. N<sub>2</sub> recorded moderate dry matter production and was followed by N<sub>1</sub>, The weed management practices applied to *kharif* rice 2014 was indicative of fact that  $W_3$  (1272g/m<sup>2</sup>) recorded more dry matter in all stages of growth and the highest recorded of higher matter at crop harvest. Similar esults were recorded by Goel and Verma (2000) <sup>[3]</sup>, Singh *et al.* (2006) <sup>[8, 10, 11, 13, 18]</sup>, Brar and Bhullar (2013) <sup>[1]</sup>.

| Table 4: Effect of INM and weed control | practices on dry matter | accumulation (g/m <sup>2</sup> ) of rice |
|---|-------------------------|--|
|---|-------------------------|--|

| Treatments            | 30 DAT | 45 DAT | 60 DAT | 75 DAT | Harvest |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2013                  |        |        |        |        |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| N1                    | 369    | 653    | 818    | 924    | 952     |  |  |  |  |  |
| N2                    | 402    | 724    | 929    | 1074   | 1111    |  |  |  |  |  |
| N3                    | 446    | 771    | 1018   | 1165   | 1206    |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 20     | 31     | 32     | 35     | 33      |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 60     | 123    | 98     | 107    | 103     |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{W}_1$        | 401    | 701    | 891    | 1013   | 1044    |  |  |  |  |  |
| $W_2$                 | 499    | 881    | 1192   | 1387   | 1437    |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>3</sub> | 532    | 925    | 1270   | 1501   | 1562    |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 18     | 30     | 31     | 34     | 32      |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 54     | 120    | 93     | 102    | 96      |  |  |  |  |  |
|                       |        | 2014   |        |        |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| N1                    | 380    | 655    | 837    | 965    | 1014    |  |  |  |  |  |
| N2                    | 528    | 889    | 1149   | 1368   | 1445    |  |  |  |  |  |
| N3                    | 541    | 922    | 1231   | 1482   | 1601    |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 14     | 29     | 36     | 44     | 44      |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 42     | 88     | 111    | 135    | 135     |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{W}_1$        | 331    | 595    | 764    | 866    | 903     |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{W}_2$        | 407    | 714    | 898    | 1036   | 1096    |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>W</b> <sub>3</sub> | 455    | 799    | 1022   | 1209   | 1272    |  |  |  |  |  |
| SEm±                  | 18     | 30     | 31     | 34     | 32      |  |  |  |  |  |
| CD (P=0.05)           | 54     | 120    | 93     | 102    | 96      |  |  |  |  |  |

N<sub>1</sub> - RDF (60-30-30 N-P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>-K<sub>2</sub>O kg/ha.), N<sub>2</sub> - RDF (75% N) + GM *dhaincha*, N<sub>3</sub> - RDF (50% N) + GM *dhaincha*, W<sub>1</sub> - Control (Weedy check), W<sub>2</sub> - Pre em. oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + HW at 25 DAT, W<sub>3</sub> - PE oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + Post em. bispyribac sodium at 15 DAT

### Effect of INM and weed control practices on yield attributes of rice

Effect of INM and weed control practices on yield attributes of rice during *kharif* 2013 and 2014 is presented under Table 5. The length of panicle was significantly higher in N<sub>3</sub> than N<sub>1</sub>. It was at par with N<sub>1</sub> during 2013 and 2014. Similarly the panicle length was significantly higher in W<sub>3</sub> than W<sub>1</sub> which was at par with W<sub>2</sub>. The mean length was higher in N<sub>3</sub> but was at par with N<sub>1</sub> and N<sub>2</sub> during *kharif* 2013.

The number of grains per panicle was significantly higher in

 $N_2$  in comparison to  $N_1$  and  $N_3$ , but  $N_2$  was at par with  $N_3$ . The data on test weight of rice indicated that  $N_2$  recorded significantly higher test weight of 22.6 g and 22.9g in 2013 and 2014 respectively. The mean test weight under same treatment was significantly higher to  $N_1$  and  $N_2$ . As regards to weed control methods  $W_3$  had the advantage to record significant higher test weight (22.4 g) as compared to  $W_1$  and  $W_3$  in 2013. Same trend was maintained during 2014. Similar observation were recorded by Halder and Patra (2007)<sup>[4]</sup>, Singh and Singh (2010)<sup>[8, 10, 11, 13, 18]</sup>.

| Table 5: | Effect of | of INM and | l weed | control | practices | on yield | attributes | of rice |
|----------|-----------|------------|--------|---------|-----------|----------|------------|---------|
|          |           |            |        |         | 1         |          |            |         |

| Treatments | Le                      | Length of panicle (cm) |          |              | o. of grains/pa | Test weight(g) |      |      |       |
|------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|------|------|-------|
| Year       | 2013                    | 2014                   | Mean     | 2013         | 2014            | Mean           | 2013 | 2014 | Mean  |
|            | <b>Fertility levels</b> |                        |          |              |                 |                |      |      |       |
| N1         | 23.2                    | 23.8                   | 23.5     | 158          | 168             | 164            | 21.7 | 22.1 | 21.9  |
| N2         | 24.1                    | 24.7                   | 24.4     | 176          | 194             | 185            | 22.6 | 22.9 | 22.75 |
| N3         | 24.5                    | 25.4                   | 24.9     | 165          | 178             | 172            | 21.9 | 21.8 | 21.85 |
| SEm±       | 0.7                     | 0.8                    | 0.5      | 7            | 8               | 7              | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2   |
| CD (0.05)  | 2.3                     | 2.5                    | 1.4      | 21           | 24              | 21             | 0.6  | 0.6  | 0.6   |
|            |                         |                        | Weed cor | ntrol method | s               |                |      |      |       |
| $W_1$      | 25.1                    | 26.7                   | 25.4     | 166          | 158             | 162            | 21.6 | 21.9 | 21.75 |
| $W_2$      | 25.3                    | 27.1                   | 26.2     | 156          | 144             | 150            | 22.4 | 22.9 | 22.65 |
| W3         | 26.7                    | 27.7                   | 27.2     | 142          | 148             | 145            | 21.7 | 22.1 | 21.9  |
| SEm±       | 0.7                     | 0.8                    | 0.5      | 7            | 8               | 7              | 0.2  | 0.2  | 0.2   |
| CD (0.05)  | 0.21                    | 2.4                    | 1.5      | 21           | 24              | 21             | 0.6  | 0.6  | 0.6   |

 $N_1$  - RDF (60-30-30 N-P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>-K<sub>2</sub>O kg/ha.),  $N_2$  - RDF (75% N) + GM *dhaincha*,  $N_3$  - RDF (50% N) + GM *dhaincha*,  $W_1$  - Control (Weedy check),  $W_2$  - Pre em. oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + HW at 25 DAT,  $W_3$  - PE oxadiargyl at 3 DAT + Post em. bispyribac sodium at 15 DAT

#### Conclusion

The growth parameters of rice viz., plant height, number of tillers per plant, dry matter accumulation per plant and Leaf area Index were significantly varied due to different treatments. It was also noted that all the growth parameters significantly increased by the combine use of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients. Among all the treatments N <sub>2</sub>W<sub>3</sub> i.e. 75% RDFN + green manuring of *dhaincha* (Sesbania aculeata) with pre emergence application of herbicide oxadiargyl followed by post emergence bispyribac-sodium expressed maximum plant growth parameters over all the treatments at different growth intervals which recorded higher plant height (96.35 cm), number of tillers per plant (212.7), (4.4), dry matter accumulation Leaf area index (1347.5g/plant), panicle length (25.8 cm) and test weight (22.33 g.) while minimum growth parameters were recorded under control.

#### References

- 1. Brar HS, Bhullar MS. Nutrient uptake by direct seeded rice and associated weeds as influenced by sowing date, variety and weed control, Indian Agricultural Research 2013;47(4):353-358.
- 2. Ghosh RK, Bhowmick Malay, Das K, Jena SC. P.K. Herbicidal management of weeds in groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*), Journal of oilseeds Res 2001;18(2):195-197.
- Goel B, Verma S. Chemical weed control in rice wheat rotation. In Proceedings of Indian Society of Agronomy, National Symposium held in Hisar, India 2007, P62-67.
- 4. Halder J, Patra AK. Effect of chemical weed control methods on productivity of transplanted rice, Indian Journal of Agronomy 2007;52(2):111-113.
- 5. IRRI. World rice statistics online query facility web page 2014. http://ricestat. irri.org:8080/wrs2/entry point. html (accessed 21.04.14)
- 6. Kiran YD, Subramanyam D, Sumathi V. Growth and

yield of transplanted rice (*Oryza sativa*) as influenced by sequential application of herbicides. Indian Journal of Weed Science 2010;42(3&4):226-228.

- 7. Kumar GS. Effect of systems of cultivation with varied N levels on growth, yield, water productivity and economics of rice. Crop Research 2008;35(3):157-164.
- Ladha JK, Kirk GJD, Bennett J, Peng S, Reddy CK, Reddy PM, Singh U. Opportunities for increased nitrogen use efficiency from improved lowland rice germplasm. Field Crops Research 2000;56:41-71.
- 9. Ladha SS. Weed management for direct sown rice under rainfed upland situation, Indian journal of Agronomy 2011;53:221-224.
- Mukherjee D, Singh RP. Effect of micro herbicides on weed dynamics, yield and economics of transplanted rice (*Oryza sativa*). Indian Journal of Agronomy 2005;50(4):292-295.
- 11. Mundra MC, Singh BP, Rinwa RS, Gupta SC. Crop productivity net return and sustainability under rice (*Oryza sativa*) - Wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) cropping system. Indian Journal of Agronomy 2003;48(4):247-250.
- 12. Parthipan T, Rabi V, Subramanian E, Ramesh T. Integrated weed management on growth and yield of transplanted rice and its residual effect on succeeding blackgram, Journal of Agronomy 2013;12:99-103.
- 13. Prasad SM, Mishra SS, Singh SJ. Effect of establishment methods, fertility levels and weed management practices on rice (*Oryza sativa* L.), Indian Journal of Agronomy 2001;46(2):216-221.
- Raju RA, Reedy MN. Integrated management of green leaf, compost, crop residues and inorganic fertilizers in rice (*Oryza sativa*) - rice system. In: Indian Journal of Agronomy 2000;45:629-635.
- 15. Raju M, Pandian BJ. Performance of wet seeded rice under different weed management practices, Oryza

2001;38(1&2):45-47.

- Rao AN, Johnson DE, Sivaprasad B, Ladha JK, Mortimar AM. Weed management in direct seeded rice, Advances in Agronomy 2007;93:153-255.
- 17. Sattin M, Berti A. Parameters of crop weed competition .Weed management for developing Countries (FAO) edited by R. Labrada 2003.
- 18. Singh RK, Singh UP. Crop establishment methods and weed management on growth and yield of dry seeded rice. Indian Journal of weed science 2014;46(2):126.
- 19. Vaiyapuri V, Sriramachandrasekharan MV. Effect of organic manures on the nutrient uptake, yield and nutrient use efficiency in lowland rice. Indian Journal of Ecobiology 2001;13:143-147.
- 20. Valera H, Balie J. The Outlook of the Rice Economy. International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), Los Banos, Philippines. Forthcoming 2020.
- Veeraputhiran R, Balasubramanian R. Evaluation of bispyribac sodium in transplanted rice, Indian Journal of Weed Science 2013;45(1):12-15.
- 22. Yadav DBRM, Punia SSAY, Malik RK, Mehta A. Weed control efficiency of Bispyribac Sodium in transplanted and direct seeded rice and its residues in soil, rice grain and straw. Environment and Ecology 2010;28(1):275-279.