# An integration of weed management practices in potato under New Alluvial soil

<sup>1</sup>Biswajit Pramanick, <sup>2</sup>Sruti Karmakar, <sup>1</sup>Koushik Brahmachari, <sup>1</sup>Rupayan Deb

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agronomy, Bidhan Chandra KrishiViswavidyalaya, Mohonpur, Nadia, 741252, <sup>2</sup>Department of Earth and Environmental Studies, National Institute of Technology, Durgapur-713209, Burdwan, West Bengal, India, E-mail: bipra.its4u@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

To study the effect of different weed control measures on the yield of potato, a field experiment was carried out with this crop (var. Kufri-Jyoti) for two consecutive years (2009-10; 2010-11) at 'C' Block farm of Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya, Kalyani, Nadia, West Bengal. The experiment was laid out in RBD with nine treatments replicated thrice. The predominant weed flora in the experimental field of potato was *Cyperus rotundas, Chenopodium album, Anagallis arvensis* and *Fumaria purviflora*. The results revealed that the maximum tuber yield and return per rupee invested *vis-à-vis* the maximum N, P, K uptake by potato and the minimum uptake of N, P and K by weeds emerged in the potato field were recorded under the treatment  $T_3$  (hand weeding at 20 DAP along with mulching) which was closely followed by the treatment  $T_9$  (Pendimethalin @1kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> along with mulching). So, the findings of the experiment provide us with a great opportunity of using herbicides and mulching in combination to cope up with the labour crisis and minimize the cost of cultivation, therefore, maximizing benefit cost ratio.

Keywords: Weed management, potato, new alluvial soil

# Introduction

Severe infestation of weeds in potato field offers the major obstacle to achieve higher yield. Weeds are the silent but virulent robbers of plant nutrients, moisture and solar energy. It also occupies the space which would otherwise be available to the main crop, harbour of insect-pests and disease causing organisms, cause adverse allelopathic effects, and increase cost of production. From the time immemorial the farmers are quite acquainted with the weeds of different categories infesting different crops at different seasons, but they were quite indifferent towards controlling them owing to the fact that they could not feel that such a tremendous loss could have been caused by weeds. Later on, in

spite of taking proper plant protection measures in relation of disease and insect-pest management, a considerable loss in crop yield even to the extent of cent percent in certain crops like potato and jute urged them to take recourse to proper weed control measures. For combating weed menace, manual weeding is usually practiced, but it is labour intensive, tedious, back breaking and does not ensure weed removal at critical stage of crop-weed competition. For the last many years, a number of herbicides like butachlor, thiobencarb and anilofos are being applied as preemergence for effective control of weeds (Budha et al. 1991). The main reasons behind the recent trend of gaining popularity of these herbicides are crop and weed seedlings look

similar which cannot easily be differentiated even by skilled labourers; labour wage is sometimes quite high or labourers are not available during the peak period of agricultural operation; and cost of chemical weeding is sometimes less than that of hand weeding. It has also been noted that no single herbicide is effective enough to keep all the weeds under control for a long time. For this reason, the concept of integrated weed management is gradually gaining popularity. Considering these views, the present investigation was undertaken to i) identify and enlist the important weed flora of potato, ii) study the effect of different weed control measures on the yield of this crop, iii) measure the uptake of nutrients by the crop and weeds, and iv) analyse the cost effectiveness of different weed control measures.

## **Materials and Methods**

A field experiment was conducted during the year of 2009-10 and 2010-11 at 'C' Block farm of Bidhan Chandra Krishi Viswavidyalaya (22°5'N latitude and 89°E longitude with an altitude of 9.75 meters above the mean sea level), Kalyani, Nadia, West Bengal with nine treatments [T<sub>1</sub>: Unweeded check, T<sub>2</sub>: Hand Weeding (HW) at 20 DAP, T<sub>3</sub>: T<sub>2</sub>+ mulching, T<sub>4</sub>: Metribuzin @0.60 kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>5</sub>: Quizalfop ethyl @1kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>6</sub>: Pendimethalin @1kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup>, T<sub>7</sub>: T<sub>4</sub> + mulching, T<sub>8</sub>: T<sub>5</sub> + mulching, T<sub>9</sub>: T<sub>6</sub>+ mulching] replicated thrice in randomized block design. The soil of the experimental field was typically Gangetic alluvium (Entisol) type with sandy clay loam in

texture having pH of 6.55, total 0.055% N, 26.29kg ha<sup>-1</sup> available  $P_2O_5$  and 148.72kg ha<sup>-1</sup> available K<sub>2</sub>O. The climate of the experimental site was subtropical humid. Potato tubers of variety Kufri-Jyoti were planted after proper tuber treatment. Recommended dose of fertilizer was 180:130:130kg N: P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>: K<sub>2</sub>O ha <sup>-1</sup> respectively. Urea, SSP and MOP were used as the sources of N, P and K respectively. Excluding the weed management practices, all the recommended improved package of practices including the plant protection measures was followed as par stipulated schedule for raising the crop. Observations on density and dry weight of weed were taken at 30, 60 days after planting (DAP) and at harvest by placing a quadrat of 0.5m×0.5m randomly at five places in each plot. At maturity, potato tuber samples were collected from each plot, oven dried at 70°C to constant weight and ground to pass through a 0.5mm sieve for chemical analysis. The nitrogen (N) content was determined by the semi-micro Kjeldahl method [AOAC 1995, method No. Ba 4b-87(90)], after the plant tissues (0.2 g) were oxidized and decomposed by concentrate sulphuric acid (10ml) with digestion mixture (K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>: Cu- $SO_4 = 5:1$ ) heated at 400°C temperature for two and half hours. Phosphorus (P) and Potassium contents were determined by the Vanado -Molybdate yellow method and flame photometry (Jackson 1973) respectively. Data for each character were statistically analysed (Gomez & Gomez 1984). Benefit : cost ratio of each weed control treatment was worked out on the basis of value of variable inputs

used in the experiment and the value of yield gained.

# **Results and Discussion**

The predominant weeds found in the experimental plots were grasses like, *Elusine indica*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium* etc; sedges like, *Cyperus rotundus*, *Cyperus iria*, *Fimbristylis littoralis* etc. and broad leaf weeds like *Chenopodium album*, *Anagallis arvensis* etc.

Both the weed density and dry weight of weeds were significantly reduced in different treated plots as compared to unweeded check. As par the data depicted in Table 1 it is quite evident that the combined approach of weed management controls weeds in a more proficient comportment than that the chemical or manual approaches do. Hand weeding at 20 DAP along with mulching  $(T_3)$  caused maximum reduction in weed growth and this treatment illustrated no statistical difference with the application of Metribuzin @0.60kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> combined with mulching  $(T_7)$  and the combined application of Pendimethalin @1kg a.i.  $ha^{-1}$  and mulching (T<sub>9</sub>) (Table 1). Similar findings were also recorded by Muhammad & Banaras (1993). Reduced weed growth under these treatments might be due to the better control of weeds through the integrated method of weed control. Analogous trend of result was documented in case of tuber yield of potato. The population of weeds was less in the plots where combined techniques of weed management were followed. As a result there was minimum crop weed competition which ultimately results better crop growth. Total yield could be considered to be the mirror of all the growth features. The maximum yield was recorded with the treatment  $T_3$  which was again statistically at par with the treatment  $T_9$  and  $T_7$ . These results corroborate the findings of Muhammad & Banaras (1993) Jaiswal & Lal (1996) and Nandal *et al.* (1999).

The maximum benefit: cost ratio *i.e.* 3.81 was achieved with the treatment  $T_3$  (hand weeding + mulching). The treatment  $T_9$  and  $T_8$  also brought about a good B: C ratio of 3.59 and 3.61, respectively. Similar findings were documented by Singh & Lal (1994).

In case of nutrient uptake by potato, the highest values were recorded with the treatment  $T_9$ and the lowest values were documented with unweeded check ( $T_1$ ). But the treatment  $T_1$ (unweeded check) depicted the maximum nutrient removal by the weeds where hand weeding at 20 DAP along with mulching caused the minimum nutrient mining by the weeds. These results validate the findings of Jaiswal (1994) Singh & Lal (1994), and Datta *et al.* (2000).

From the experiment, it is flawless to opine that the integrated approach of weed management is the best amongst all the treatments used in the field to control all kinds of weeds. Though the treatment  $T_3$  *i.e.* hand weeding along with mulching chronicled the maximum economic benefit but sometimes labour paucity was there which limits this weed management practice. As the twin application of Metribuzin @0.60kg a.i. ha<sup>-1</sup> and mulching (T<sub>7</sub>) and the application of Pendimethalin @1kg a.i.  $ha^{-1}$  combined with mulching (T<sub>9</sub>) showed encouraging weed control *vis-à-vis* enhanced tuber yield of potato. So we can successfully replace the

#### Table 1.

Effects of treatments on total weed density, biomass, weed control efficiency, tuber yield and B:C ratio of potato (pooled data)

Treat- ment	Total weed density (No. m <sup>-2</sup> )			Total weed biomass (g m <sup>-2</sup> )			Weed control efficiency (%)			Tuber vield	B:C
	30 DAP	60 DAP	At harvest	30 DAP	60 DAP	At harvest	30 DAP	60 DAP	At harvest	(t ha <sup>-1</sup> )	ratio
T <sub>1</sub>	21.26	20.89	44.46	8.14	16.29	26.14				19.44	2.66
T <sub>2</sub>	17.37	14.27	32.91	4.22	11.11	18.16	36.23	27.62	23.51	23.48	3.14
T <sub>3</sub>	6.03	5.95	17.56	2.11	4.84	14.94	74.55	79.91	49.24	29.32	3.81
$T_4$	10.64	12.19	26.76	4.86	6.29	16.69	45.22	55.71	42.17	24.01	3.20
T <sub>5</sub>	13.15	11.27	25.84	3.88	9.88	13.62	38.17	51.34	40.23	23.64	3.04
T <sub>6</sub>	14.54	12.40	28.09	6.44	12.12	19.47	41.90	45.86	32.06	25.52	3.45
T <sub>7</sub>	7.80	8.98	24.66	3.14	8.01	11.05	65.83	73.85	61.05	26.43	3.42
T <sub>8</sub>	8.64	9.92	20.24	4.12	5.47	12.36	25.17	63.78	55.77	27.37	3.61
T <sub>9</sub>	11.00	9.01	22.95	4.31	9.92	16.24	48.82	57.56	45.28	28.88	3.59
SEm (±)	0.97	1.21	2.07	0.98	1.89	1.62				0.89	
CD (P=0.05)	3.01	3.63	6.01	2.65	5.23	4.69				2.79	

DAP- Days after planting

## Table 2.

Effects of treatments on nutrient uptake by potato and weed grown in potato field (pooled data)

Treatment	Nutrient upt	ake by potato	(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Nutrient uptake by Weeds (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )				
Treatment –	Ν	Р	K	Ν	Р	K		
T <sub>1</sub>	51.00	13.28	59.32	69.80	19.52	219.27		
$T_2$	55.28	17.45	74.27	57.35	15.21	206.08		
T <sub>3</sub>	91.03	31.54	132.45	19.43	10.44	91.33		
$T_4$	69.27	22.54	92.07	64.42	17.14	173.60		
T <sub>5</sub>	69.62	21.50	88.90	67.73	16.52	176.44		
T <sub>6</sub>	77.72	24.29	100.70	61.44	17.66	164.79		
T <sub>7</sub>	83.41	26.79	130.50	42.83	15.22	154.19		
T <sub>8</sub>	84.51	26.65	107.73	51.65	13.08	139.08		
T <sub>9</sub>	102.40	32.56	124.90	43.81	12.43	130.89		
SEm (±)	1.72	1.78	2.61	1.89	1.19	1.81		
CD (P=0.05%)	5.47	5.67	7.53	5.49	3.69	5.44		

## **Literature Cited**

- AOAC. 1995 In *Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International* (Ed Cunniff PA), 16th Ed., AOAC International, Gaithersburg, MD.
- Budha MN Krishnasamy M Ramaswasmy M. 1991 Evaluation of herbicides for weed control in lowland rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 23: 87-88.
- Datta JK Garai AK Roy K. 2000 Bioefficacy of treflan 48EC (trifluralin) against the weeds of potato (Solanum tuberosum L.). Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science 6(6): 645-49.
- Gomez KA Gomez AA. 1984 *Statistical Procedures* for Agricultural Research. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Jackson ML. 1973 *Soil Chemical Analysis*, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India.
- Jaiswal VP Lal SS. 1996 Efficacy of cultural and chemical weed control methods in potato (Solanum tuberosum). Indian Journal of Agronomy **41**(3): 454-56.

- Jaiswal VP. 1994 Effect of weed management and nitrogen level on nutrient loss and tuber yield of potato (*Solamim tuberosum*). *Indian Journal* of Agricultural Sciences **64**(6): 373-77.
- Muhammad B Banaras M. 1993 Impact of weed competition on potato production. *Pakistan Journal of Agricultural Research* **14**(1): 64-71.
- Nandal DP Om Hari Dhiman SD. 1999 Management of weeds with herbicides in transplanted rice. *Indian Journal of Weed Science* 31: 75-77.
- Singh K Lal SS. 1994 Herbicidal weed control efficiency and nutrient removal by weeds in potato (*Solanum tuberosum*) under north-eastern hill condition. *Indian Journal of Agronomy* **39** (2): 336-39.